#### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 498

SP 022 260

**AUTHOR** TITLE

Rounds, Thomas S.; And Others

An Analysis of Teachers' Rule Systems at a Successful School. Verification Inquiry, Volume IV. Ecological

Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practice.

INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and

Development, San Francisco, Calif.

SPONS AGENCY REPORT NO

National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.

EPSSP-81-13

PUB DATE

81

CONTRACT GRANT NOTE

400-80-01-03 OB-NIE-G-78-0103

113p.; For related documents, see SP 022 256, SP 022 258, and SP 022 261-267. Some numbered volumes in this series were never released. Figures contain

small, broken type.

PUB TYPE

Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.

Authoritarianism; \*Behavior Standards; Class Organization; \*Classroom Environment; Classroom Research; \*Classroom Techniques; \*Discipline Policy; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; School Effectiveness; Socialization; \*Student

Behavior; Teacher Attitudes

#### **ABSTRACT**

Reported on is an analysis of rule systems established in successful elementary school classrooms. The report's first chapter provides an introduction to this verification inquiry, part of a larger study, Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practice. In chapter 2, the sample, methodology, and data analysis procedures used in the rules analysis are described. The ll classrooms, and the teachers and students in them, from the elementary school studied are described. Also discussed are data collection procedures, including narrative descriptions and classroom observations. Data analysis methodology, including identification of rules in each classroom, classification of rules, and consonance of rules across classrooms, is detailed. The third chapter discusses the nature of the rules found as a result of the study, and an analysis of rules across the classrooms is included. An analysis of rules within categories covers classroom regulations in the following areas: procedural, academic, talking and noise, mobility, ethical, school-imposed, and miscellaneous. Conclusions regarding the findings are drawn in the fourth chapter. References are included along with two appendices which present instructions to teachers for coding classroom rules and charts of teachers' rules. (CJ)

\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document. \*





Ecological Perspectives

for

# SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLING PRACTICE

VERIFICATION INQUIRY

Volume IV

An Analysis of Teachers' Rule Systems at a Successful School

Thomas S. Rounds
Donald W. Swarthout
John R. Mergendoller
Beatrice A. Ward
William J. Tikunoff

Report EPSSP-81-13

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Teremy George

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEFARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as re-eved from the person or organization organization of produced to the control of the

Minor hariges have been made to improve reproduction quality

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The work reported herein was begun under Contract No. OB-NIE-G-78-0103 from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare and continued under NIE Contract 400-80-01-03 from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education, to the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education and no official endorsement by the Institute should be inferred.



#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The analysis of the rule systems of the 11 classrooms at Central School were based on day-long nonparticipant observations in each classroom during the first four days of the school year and additional observation days two weeks and six weeks later in the school year. Analysis was done by the Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling staff and the collaborating teachers.

After the rules in each class were classified, the rules in each class were matched with those in other classes to determine rules common to two or more classes. Then the rules were placed in seven categories of rules identified in a previous study (Tikunoff & Ward, 1978). These categories are procedural, academic, talking and noise, mobility, ethical, school-imposed, and miscellaneous rules. Findings concerning the placement and distribution of rules in these seven categories are summarized as follows.

First, as students proceeded through entry into the elementary school year, they were exposed more rules in the lower grades than in the upper grades. Second, teachers in the lower grades tended. to emphasize procedural rules and used a deductive rule-setting procedure. On the other hand, teachers in the upper grades used proportionately fewer procedural rules, and their rule-setting style was inductive and reactive. Third, there was a greater focus on academic rules in the upper grades than in the lower grades. Fourth, there was a greater emphasis on mobility rules in Grades K-2 than in higher grades. Fifth, ethical rules were particularly prevalent in the special education classes, reflecting the need for students in these classes to master the student role. Sixth, more than one half of the rules identified in all classes fell into the procedural and academic categories. Seventh, the large number of procedural and academic rules suggests that these are areas where students may have trouble adapting to the classroom requirements, especially in the younger grades, where the number of rules is large, the children's capacity to encode, store, and retrieve information is relatively undeveloped. and the student role is not yet routinized.

The second part of the rules analysis investigated subcategories of rules within the seven categories. The rules in each subcategory were examined to determine which rules were widely shared and which were idiosyncratic across the 11 classrooms. It was found that some rules were precise, some were vague, some were practical, some were impractical, and some were hortatory or idealistic. Generally, the common rules reflected problems the teachers agreed existed, solutions teachers agreed to use as a group, or, in a few instances, solutions not agreed upon. There were many idiosyncratic rules, reflecting either low teacher consensus regarding appropriate student behavior or problems unique to a single classroom.



Teachers had common rules involving when students should not talk and how they should obtain the teachers' attention. All classes also had rules requiring students to put their names on their papers, listen to the teachers, finish their work, and place completed work in the appropriate place. The teachers also agreed on rules for gum chewing and riding bicycles to school. The need for an adult to be present in order for students to enter various areas in the school also was commonly prescribed.

In summary, the classroom rules established at the beginning of the school year at Central School stressed procedural and academic behavior. In many respects, teachers throughout the school applied similar rules, thus making the students' adaptation to school more consistent and easier across the grade level than would have been the case if each teacher had employed a totally idiosyncratic set of rules. As a result, appropriate classroom conduct should have been achievable by a majority of students in this school.



# Ecological Perspectives for SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLING PRACTICE

#### VERIFICATION INQUIRY

Volume IV

ÇÇ)

An Analysis of Teachers' Rule Systems at a Successful School

Thomas S. Rounds
Donald W. Swarthout
John R. Mergendoller
Beatrice A. Ward
William J. Tikunoff

Report EPSSP-81-13

William J. Tikunoff Director, Programs on Schooling

FAR WEST LABORATORY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1855 FOLSOM STREET - SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA 941 18



#### **PREFACE**

This volume is one in a series of reports of a multifaceted study which examined and described the successful schooling practices at a single elementary school in the San Francisco Bay Area. The series reports the work conducted by the Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practices Project (EPSSP) at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. The volumes in the series include:

- Volume 1: Overview of the Verification Study
- Volume 2: An Analysis of the Activity Structures at a Successful School
- Volume 3: An Analysis of Teachers' Ideal Students
- Volume 4: An Analysis of Teachers' Rule Systems at a Successful School
- Volume 5: An Exploration of Elementary Students Perceptions of Classroom Rules and Teacher Authority at a Successful School
- Volume 6: Ecological Case Studies of Classroom Instruction at a Successful School
- Volume 7: Successful Schools and Classrooms: A Summary , of the Findings of the Verification Inquiry and Implications for the Provision of Successful Schooling Experiences for All Students

The goal of the Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practices Project is to analyze school settings where successful instruction and educational practices are occurring and describe these settings so that they may be implemented by other educational practitioners. In addition, the EPSSP Project seeks to work in collaboration with school people to improve students' educational experiences and make less successful schools more successful.

The Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practices Project is one of a series of long-term, innovative efforts to improve the educational opportunities for all children funded by the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. Dr. William Tikunoff and Dr. Beatrice A. Ward are the Co-Principal Investigators. Other professional staff members include Dr. John R. Mergendoller, Project Director; Dr. Alexis L. Mitman, Associate Research Scientist; and Mr. Thomas S. Rounds, Associate Research Scientist.

We wish to thank Dr. Virginia Koehler and Mr. Michael Cohen of the Teaching and Learning Division, National Institute of Education, for their support of this project and their willingness to explore innovative ways of approaching the problems that confront educators. explore innovative ways of approaching the problems that confront educators.

We also wish to thank the principal, teachers, students, and parents of Central School. Their participation and support were essential to the success of this collaborative research effort. Their willingness to inquire into and analyze multiple features of the school and the instructional program made it possible to conduct the in-depth inquiry reported in the volumes listed above. Together, we learned much about successful schooling practices.

Many individuals helped in the preparation of this particular report, and we wish to thank them for their efforts. Jane Danielwicz, Michael Strong, Doug Macbeth, Janice Schaefer, Cecily Weston, and Joanie Boyle assisted with the interviews and the classroom observations, as did Donald Swarthout, a former member of the professional staff now with the Charlotte, North Carolina School District. Paul Halley, Charlie Ray Altizer, and Barbara Murray prepared this manuscript. To all, thank you.

Beatrice A. Ward William J. Tikunoff John R. Mergendoller

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	,	1	•				Page
EXECUTIVE SU	MMARY	• • • • •				•	i
PREFACE	· · · · · · ·		• • • •			•	, V
CHAPTER ONE:	INTRODUCTI	ON	• • • •	• • •	• • •	. •	1
CHAPTER TWO:	SAMPLE, ME	THODOLOGY,	, AND DAT	ΓA ANALYSI:	S		- 7
Sample	• • • • •	• • • • •	• • •			. •	7
Methodo	logy: Data	Collection	1		·		. 8
Methodo	logy: Data	Analy <b>s</b> is		• • • •			9
· C1	entification assification nsonance of	of Rules				•	9 9 11
CHAPTER THRE	E: FINDINGS		• • • •			. •	1,3
Cross-C	lass Analysi	s		• • • • •		. •	13
Analysi	s of Rules W	ithin Cate	egories			•	15
Ac Ta Mo Et Sc	ocedural Rul ademic Rules lking and No bility Rules hical Rules hool-Imposed scellaneous	ise Rules			• • •		16 21 25 27 28 29
CHAPTER FOUR	: CONCLUSIO	NS					33
Summary	of Findings	• • • •			• • •	. •	33
Relatio	nship of Maj	or Findin	gs to Pro	evious Res	earch .	•	37
REFERENCES	• • • • •				• • •		39
APPENDIX A:	INSTRUCTION RULES	S TO TEAC	HERS FOR	CODING CL	ASSROOM		A-1
APPENDIX B:	CHARTS OF T	EACHERS' I	RULES .	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		•	<b>B−1</b>



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	<u>Title</u>		- Page
2.1	Central School Rule Categories and Subcatego	ries .	. 12
3.1	Cross-Class Rules Analysis: Total Number of by Category and Teacher	Rules	. 14
4.1	Rules Reflecting Consensus Across Classrooms Central School	; at	. 36



#### CHAPTER ONE

#### INTRODUCTION

The Verification Inquiry, of which the Rules Analysis reported herein are one part, is an activity of the Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practice Program. The program is designed to identify, describe, and develop indicators of successful schooling practices by developing an ecological theory of teaching, developing research methods appropriate for studying schooling practices from an ecological perspective, and developing strategies for implementing the successful practices in a manner that attends to the complex contexts that exist in schools and classrooms.

In the traditional view that has long prevailed in education, teaching has been defined, researched, and promulgated largely on the basis of the psychology of individual learning. The study of motivation, feedback, learning style, work rate, and reinforcement, to name but a few, has been approached largely from the perspective of the individual learner. While the contributions of such a view cannot be omitted from any comprehensive statement of teaching, they do not suffice as an explanation of what teaching is or as a guide to the practice of teaching.

In the institution of the school, the teacher instructs a group of students in the classroom, and the student learns in proximity with other contemporaries. Teaching and learning are social experiences, introducing a host of forces beyond the purview of individual learning psychology. As Bossert (1977) observed, "The collective nature of instruction is one of the most apparent but little examined factors of classroom life affecting the teacher" (p: 19). Reliance on the psychology of individual learning also has been inadequate because it "has produced primarily theories and data dealing with questions of learning, and these are considerably different from and less applicable to the classroom than theories and data relevant to problems of teaching (Brophy, 1974, p. 48).

The traditional view, moreover, has been concerned with teaching behavior as the stimulus for individual learning outcomes, assuming direct teacher causality while generally ignoring student response and environmental variables and linkage processes (for example, see Doyle, 1977). As a growing number of critics have pointed out, this is an unmerited and uninstructive assumption.

What is needed is theory which takes into account the group nature of instruction as well as the psychology of individual learning. Such theory must attend to the sociological nature of teaching, as

well as the interrelationships among the complex set of components that constitute the environment of teaching.

Such an ecological perspective, while relatively new to research on teaching, has been part of the thinking in educational research for some time. For example, researchers have agreed that we need to attend to more "things" in the classroom in order to understand even the simplest phenomenon. Most prominently, the works of Barker (1968) and two of his colleagues, Kounin (1977) and Gump (1967), focused attention on factors beyond the teacher-student dyad. In terms of requisite methodology, Barker (1968), and more recently, Bronfenbrenner (1976), Doyle (1977, 1979à, 1979b), Charlesworth (1976), and Rhodes (1978), among others, discussed procedures and processes whereby ecological research may be conducted.

Based on review of the above work and preliminary investigations undertaken by the Ecological Perspectives staff, the Verification Inquiry was designed to incorporate and test the following parameters of an ecological view of classroom-based teaching and learning.

1. An ecological theory of teaching is meant to connote theory that is grounded in the multiple realities of everyday classroom life as it occurs in a variety of natural settings and is perceived by a variety of participants. Thus, given a particular classroom setting, the theory must be meaningful for teachers and others involved with day-to-day life in that setting. The power of such theory rests with its capability to provide a variety of perspectives useful for analysis of the ecology of classrooms, taking into consideration the multiple elements of classroom interaction and how these interrelate. Further, analysis using perspectives of the theory should provide a teacher with information useful for planning, monitoring, and evaluating instruction -- information which is not included in or provided by traditional theories of teaching.

In order to tap these multiple factors, the following premises for development of an ecological theory seem appropriate:

- First, the forum for conduct of ecological research is the natural environment. This focus primarily is on the class-room and aligns with what Bronfenbrenner (1976) calls "ecologically valid" research. By this he means research that is conducted in settings that occur in the culture or subculture for other than research purposes. Such research maintains the ecological integrity of the setting while conducting the research. In addition, the data-collection methodologies do not alter the natural behavior of individuals in that setting, or alter it to the smallest degree possible, to ensure the internal validity of the research. For a further treatment of this premise see Tikunoff and Ward (1978).
- Second, the focus of ecological data collection and analysis in this natural environment is on environment-behavior relationships. As Doyle points out, ecological analysis requires

- a two-stage process: (a) defining the dimensions of the environment, in this case the classroom; and (b) identifying teacher and student strategies that are successful and not successful in that environment. Embedded in this dimension is the notion of a third facet of environment-behavior relationships, reciprocal causality.
- Third, ecological research is concerned with the functional value or adaptive significance of behaviors in an environment. Among these are those mediational behaviors students use to "navigate" or perform within classroom environments (Doyle, 1979a). Such a view of classrooms, which focuses on adaptive behaviors in conjunction with the reciprocal analysis of environment-behavior relationships, can provide a systemic view of classroom life. If the ecological theory is to be useful to teachers, it will have to provide information that shows how students function, given changes in elements within the classroom environment.
- 2. Development of an Ecological Theory of Teaching requires a multidisciplinary approach. Thus, theory is grounded in classroom practice, while, at the same time, it is infused with knowledge from multiple disciplines. For purposes of the Verification Inquiry, three perspectives from different disciplines have been applied. These are: (1) the activity structure perspective taken from the field of sociology, particularly the work of Bossert (1979), Dreeben (1967), and Bidwell (1972); (2) the student participation perspective, building from the work of sociolinguists such as Philips (1972) and Mehan (1979); and (3) students' cognitive understandings relative to various aspects of schooling, building from the work of cognitive psychologists and sociologists such as DeSoto (1979), Weiner (1979), Damon (1977), Furth (1978), and Hoffman (1977). Each of these is discussed further later in this report as they apply to the specific research findings reported Herein.
- 3. In addition to developing the proposed Ecological Theory of Teaching, it is necessary to devise ways of implementing its operation in classrooms and schools. Traditionally, this function has been seen as one of translation or adaptation from research into practice. However, findings from the Interactive Research and Development on Teaching (IR&DT) study conducted by Tikunoff, Ward, and Griffin (1979), suggest ways whereby implementation of the theory might be facilitated by the manner in which the research is conducted. Among these are:
  - To understand classroom teaching-learning ecologically, it is more productive to inquire into these aspects with the teacher. This partnership serves to provide information which is not otherwise available, such as (a) a teacher's intent, as embodied in the selection and utilization of curriculum and instructional materials, and (b) a teacher's expectations for student behavior. Jackson's (1968) term "observant participators" describes well how the teacher participates in this enterprise.

- Understanding classroom teaching-learning ecologically is both more productive and more complete when (a) individual classrooms are observed for full days at a time across time (in contrast to isolated, drop-in observations), and (b) all classrooms at a given school are involved in observation. The first condition ensures that an isolated, observed event is not unusual and gives additional perspectives of that event in relation to what else goes on at other times during the day or week or across a month or year. The second provides for observation of the whole school as a social system and allows the analyst to begin to separate "school-wide effects" from "classroom effects." To understand the ecological impact of schooling for a given student, it is necessary to understand not only each of the social-instructional classroom systems through which the student will matriculate, but how these are orchestrated into the "whole" experience. This can be done best when an entire school is involved.
- Participation of teachers in conducting the research adds both to defining constructs and to considering the usefulness of the constructs to classroom teachers. In some instances in the Verification Inquiry, constructs taken from fields of inquiry unusual to education, such as the three listed above, were given concrete classroom-based definitions based on the form(s) in which they were observed in classrooms and the language (terms) teachers used to describe those events. In other instances, "research" terms were explained in more detail to the teachers. In a sense, this represented the development of a working lexicon between teachers and researchers not unlike the process reported by Smith and Geoffrey (1968). In addition, the ability of teachers to utilize the constructs in order to analyze events in their own classrooms, and to plan instructional events to achieve the predetermined goals inherent in the events, lent credence to their inclusion in the emerging theory.
- The nature of reciprocity in the ways teachers and researchers work greatly contributes to the success of the research. Rist (1970) used the term "reciprosity" to describe how he behaved as a nonparticipant observer in classrooms while conducting his research. Like Rist, reciprocity during the Verification Inquiry has included project researchers offering technical assistance in curriculum matters, lending instructional materials, working with individual students in instruction in the classroom, and offering workshops for all the teachers in particular instructional strategies. In return, teachers have offered their classrooms as data sources, but, additionally, have given generously of their recess and lunchtime to clarify behavior for the observers, and have participated wholeheartedly in the research enterprise, placing great trust in the researchers.

Within the above framework, the Verification Inquiry was conducted as an in-depth case study in a single elementary school nominated

by several educational constituent groups as a successful school. As noted above, the purposes of the Inquiry were to develop an ecological theory of teaching that builds upon the three perspectives listed above, develop research methods appropriate to such ecological inquiry, and develop strategies for improving teaching and learning using the ecological perspectives. More specifically, the Inquiry sought to answer the following sets of questions:

- What activity structures are utilized in elementary school classrooms? In a single successful elementary school, what differences, if any, occur in the structures that are utilized at various grade levels (K-6)? Are activity structures and teacher behaviors interrelated? If so, in what ways? What effect(s) do activity structure characteristics have upon the ways students behave successfully in classrooms? How do these latter requirements relate to schoollevel goals and expectations?
- What are teacher expectations for student performance as represented in the teacher's perceptions of an ideal student in a single, successful elementary school?
- 3. What rules systems are established in the classrooms in a single successful elementary school? Are these rules consistent with teacher expectations, activity structure demands, school goals?
- 4. What are students' perceptions of classroom rules and teacher authority in a successful elementary school? What are the implications of these perceptions for successful classroom practice?
- 5. When instructional events are studied from the ecological perspectives, what relationships appear to produce more successful outcomes for students?

The findings reported in this volume focus on Question 3. The chapters that follow provide, first, an overview of the sample and methodology, a comparison of the rules found in the 11 classrooms at Central School, a discussion of the nature of the rules, and conclusions regarding the findings. In their entirety, these rules and the accompanying discussion provide a guide to the student participation requirements at Central School.

The rules analysis responds to several concerns of the Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practice agenda. First, rules provide vital information about the participation requirements teachers demand in their classrooms. Many researchers have stressed the salience of the nonacademic aspects of school, including the rules and norms. This point has been underscored by Parsons (1959), Dreeban (1968), Jackson (1968), and Bidwell (1972). Bidwell suggested that schooling has two major socialization aspects: the process of technical socialization, or students' academic performance, and moral socialization -- acquiring "values and goals for conduct," learning



15

and becoming "responsive to moral rules norms," and gaining "a view of the social world as a moral order" -- the social foci of the instructional-social system (1972, p. 1).

Rules in an elementary school are the explicit part of the socialization process, and a study of these rules will help clarify the socialization goals of the school. Rules also define the requirements for successful participation in the day-to-day activities of the class-room. In order to know how to write in a journal, obtain permission to use the bathroom, participate in snacktime, or talk to the teacher during a test, a student must master and employ a series of rules. Failure to use the pertinent rule may result in censure from the teacher or other students and perhaps in failure on an academic or social task. Analysis of the rules operating in a given classroom allows us to determine the boundaries and limits of successful participation in that classroom. Without a knowledge of classroom rules, it is impossible to determine what is appropriate behavior in any classroom situation.

A second reason for analyzing rule systems comes from previous research conducted by the Far West Laboratory research team. Tikunoff and Ward (1978) conducted a naturalistic study of the initiation of students into three classroom social systems. The purpose of this investigation was to answer the following question: "How do teachers establish the instructional system for their classrooms and how do they socialize their students into that system?" (p. 2). This question emerged from collaboration with teachers who had participated in a previous study conducted by the Far West Laboratory research team (Tikunoff, Ward, Dunbar & Lash, 1978). These teachers expressed the belief that an answer to this question would be extremely valuable to other teachers, especially new teachers who are unfamiliar with how institutional systems become operational.

The final purpose for the rules analysis arose at a professional development meeting involving the school and EPSSP staff. During the course of this meeting, several teachers expressed an interest in analyzing the rules which regulate student behavior in their own classrooms as well as the classrooms of their colleagues. There was a common desire to compare all the classrooms in terms of the various rules which were put into operation. It was felt that these comparisons would lead to an understanding of students' experiences as they advanced through the grades at Central School. Moreover, the fact that an entire elementary school was being studied provided a unique chance to pursue one of the recommendations which emerged from the previous study. Tikunoff and Ward (1978) urged educational researchers to pay more attention "to the amount of consonance or dissonance that exists among the systems in which an elementary student is placed over a period of several years" (p. 71).

#### CHAPTER TWO

#### SAMPLE, METHODOLOGY, AND DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter briefly discusses the sample and the methodology and data analysis procedures used in the rules analysis. A more detailed discussion may be found in Volume I.

#### Sample

The Verification Inquiry was conducted in a semirural, suburban area on the outskirts of a large metropolitan center. This area underwent rapid growth during the last two decades. While a large portion of the work force now commutes into the central metropolis, the numerous feed mills that remain remind the visitor that agriculture still plays a significant role in the area's economy.

Central School is one of seven elementary schools in a school district serving approximately half the suburban area. The population was largely white and middle class. At the time of the study, fewer than four percent of the students at Central School belonged to minority groups. The school was selected for study because of its reputation as an "innovative" and "successful" school, based on the nominations of state, county, and other educational experts.

The students at Central School demonstrated above-average performance on standardized achievement measures. The grade-equivalent scores 1.for Spring 1979 showed that, on average, third-graders had a



<sup>1</sup> The use of grade-equivalent scores reflects the reporting preference of the district, not the authors. These kinds of scores are commonly misinterpreted and, therefore, their use is ill-advised. In the example above, the third-grade score of 4.3 on reading should not be interpreted to mean that third-graders were performing at a Tevel slightly above that of the average fourth-grader. This comparison cannot be made since the content of a fourth-grade reading test, would be different from that of a third-grade reading test. It is possible that if the Central School third-graders took a fourth-grade reading test, their scores would be below 4.0. What the score of 4.3 does indicate is, that, relative to the average third-grader in the state (or nation) taking a test with third-grade content, the average third-grader at Central School scored better.

 $\mathcal{O}$ 

grade-equivalent score of 4.3 on Reading and 4.4 on Math. Similarly, fifth-graders had an average score of 6.4 on Reading and 5.8 on Math. Relative to other elementary schools in the district, Central School achievement performance was at the median.

The median age of the 11 teachers who participated in the study at Central School was 38; most were between 33 and 40 years of age. The median number of years of teaching experience in this group was 14, and all of the teachers had had at least 10 years of experience with the exception of Teacher N. The average length of time each had been teaching at Central was 9 years.

Further information regarding the site and sample may be found in Volume I of the Verification Inquiry. A discussion of the methodology employed in the rules analysis portion of the inquiry follows.

#### Methodology: Data Collection

The data collection and analysis procedures used to collect the data reported in this volume were naturalistic and descriptive, and have been employed by the EPSSP staff in several other studies. The general principles of this methodology are outlined in Volume I. The discussion that follows is limited to the procedures used in the rules analysis.

The most important data source for the study of rules was narrative descriptions generated during the first four days of school (July 25, 1979 to July 28, 1979). (Central was a year-round school and began its year in late July.) Each classroom was observed for the full school day. Observers arrived at Central before the school day began and continued observing until classes were dismissed. Observation continued during all instructional periods; observers took breaks or chatted informally with teachers during scheduled recess and lunch periods. Each observer remained in the same class for the four days of observation. Additional single days of observation also were conducted during week 2 and week 6 of the school year.

While in the classroom, the observers took field notes on activities occurring, including all teacher verbalizations serving to establish classroom rules, to sanction student behavior, or to evaluate student work. Observers recorded these comments verbatim and noted whether they were directed to an individual student, to a group of students, or to the entire class. Examples of rule-defining remarks include "John, stop that!", "Everybody listen while Kate is talking!", "Jim, that's a great diorama," or "Now, I want you to raise your hands before you give the answer." At the end of each observation day, the observers used their notes to dictate narrative descriptions.

The primary data set consisted of four narrative descriptions for each teacher from the beginning of the school year, each description containing 15 and 30 pages, and two follow-up descriptions. These latter narratives were not as detailed as those prepared during days



1 to 4. Rather, notes were made regarding new rules that were enforced or old rules that still were being applied.

#### Methodology: Data Analysis

Three types of analyses were conducted. First, the rules for each classroom were identified, then they were classified. Finally, cross-classroom comparisons were made. These procedures are described below.

#### Identification of Rules in Each Classroom

The first step of data analysis involved the identification of the rules that were established at the beginning of the school year in each classroom. Both teachers and researchers participated independently in this task. The collaborating teachers were asked to read through their own descriptive narratives and to code all the rules, both explicit and implicit, that were introduced. Each teacher was presented with a set of "Instructions for Coding Classroom Rules." These instructions explained their task and are reproduced in Appendix A. These instructions contained the following definition of a rule:

A classroom rule is a general, normative guideline which specifies the kinds of behavior for which students can be punished or rewarded.

The teachers listed rules that appeared in the protocols for their respective classrooms. For each rule the teachers were instructed to: 1) Assign a number to indicate the order in which each rule appeared in the narrative; 2) Note the day it first appeared as well as the page in the narrative where its introduction was described; 3) Provide a descriptive label for the rule; and 4) Formulate a brief description of the content of the rule.

At the same time, three senior EPSSP investigators studied the narratives and coded rules using similar guidelines. Two coders each analyzed the narrative for four different classrooms while the third analyst coded the data for the remaining three classrooms. Thus each set of data was analyzed by one member of the research team.

The teachers and investigators then met together in pairs and compared the rules each had identified. Any discrepancies were discussed and resolved. A list of rules for each classroom emerged from this collaborative process.

#### Classification of Rules

The next step in data analysis involved the classification of the rules on each of the lists, using the seven categories previously



identified by Tikunoff and Ward (1978). Two graduate research interns did the initial coding of the Central School rules. The seven categories used are:

- procedural rules, or norms that define, describe, or delimit the students' behavior in other than specifically instructional situations. These rules are concerned primarily with classroom management, scheduling, movement in and out of the classroom, and use of materials;
- 2) academic rules, or norms that define, describe, or delimit the students' behavior in instructional situations;
- 3) talking and noise rules, the boundaries the teacher sets on talk in the classroom as well as other sanctionable noises;
- 4) mobility rules, restrictions placed on the students' physical movement in the classroom;
- 5) ethical rules, or norms referring to students' rights or responsibilities;
- 6) school-imposed rules, or formal rules enforced as part of school or district policy; and
- 7) miscellaneous rules, a residual category of teacher concerns for which students were sanctioned, distinct from the above categories.

Two graduate research interns did the initial coding of the Central School rules. Their average rate of agreement on the categories in which the rules should be placed was 70 percent. A senior member of the research staff also coded the seven classes in which there was less than 75 percent agreement between the coders. Most of the disagreements reflected a lack of familiarity with the categories and were easily resolved following a careful inspection of the guidelines and examples given in the instructions. However, there were a few rules that were difficult to classify because they spanned more than one category. For example, the following rule covers both academic and procedural events: "If you don't know how to do something, ask a first grader." Similarly, some rules seemed to suggest more than one category, e.g., "May get a drink without asking." Here, one coder responded to the mobility aspect of getting a drink, while the other coder perceived it as a procedural rule. In many cases it was difficult to distinguish mobility rules from procedural rules. It was decided to classify some of these ambiguous cases as miscellaneous rules.

#### Consonance of Rules Across Classrooms

After the rules had been placed into one of the seven categories, charts of the rules in each category were compiled. These compilations are reported in Appendix B.

These charts were presented then to the faculty as a whole during an all-day meeting devoted to the rules analysis. The teachers discussed the charts and made a few changes in the classification of certain rules. In addition, several rules introduced after the first four days were added.

The teachers' modifications were used to revise the rule lists for each of the classrooms as well as the charts that compared the classrooms within each of the seven categories of rules.

After agreement had been reached relative to the categorization of all the rules in each classroom, each category (except the miscellaneous rules) was examined carefully to identify subcategories of rules. These subcategories were derived by the EPSSP staff. They are summarized in Table 2.1.

Chapter Three discusses the findings of the rules analysis.

11

Table 2.1
Central School Rule Categories and Subcategories

CATEGORY	SUBCATEGORY
Procedural	Use and disposal of materials
	Appropriate time and procedures for entering and leaving the classroom
,	Use of chairs
	"Child of the Day" procedures
	Class meeting procedures participation in activities
	Participation in activities
	Clean-up activity regulations
	Eating and drinking in the classroom guidelines
Atademic	Students' behavior during worktime
	Students' behavior when they finish assigned work
	Students' behavior as they prepare to work
_	Procedure to use to interact with teacher
	Test-taking procedures
	Small-group behavior
Talking	Talking during academic periods
and	Talking during nonacademic periods
Noise	Talking rules generally in force
	Teacher-student interactions, e.g., when to talk to teacher
Mobility	Normal movement about classroom
	Movement on certain, specialized equipment
	Restrictions on physical contact between students
Ethical	Courtesy among students
	Respect for teacher
	Conflict resolution or prevention
School-	Students' behavior during recess o
Imposed	Students' behavior between their time of arrival at school and the time that formal classes begin
	General courtesy guidelines
	Need for adult supervision
	Parent responsibilities
Miscel- laneous	(Not subcategorized)



#### CHAPTER THREE

#### **FINDINGS**

This chapter presents the findings of a rules analysis of enforced or implied rules and regulations concerning student performance and behavior in 11 classrooms at Central Elementary School. As noted earlier, the data were collected during the first four days of the 1979/1980 school year in classes comprising learning levels ranging from kindergarten to sixth grade. Two follow-up observations also were conducted.

The results of the rules analysis are presented first. These data provide an overview of the kinds of rules employed in all 11 class-rooms and a comparison of rule-setting practices therein.

The rules are classified into the seven categories or domains listed in Chapter Two. A brief statement of the general findings in each of the seven major categories is then followed by an examination of their subcategories. The order in which the seven major categories of rules appear, followed by their appropriate subcategories, is as follows: (1) procedural; (2) academic; (3) talking and noise; (4) mobility; (5) ethical; (6) school-imposed; and (7) miscellaneous. Primary emphasis is given to a delineation of the findings in each subcategory, including a description of the rules in each, notation of the rules common among teachers, and discussion of rules idiosyncratic to individual classrooms.

### Cross-Class Analysis

Table 3.1 presents the total number of rules by category for each of the 11 classrooms observed at Central Elementary School. The organization of the table reflects the progression from kindergarten through sixth grade. The last two teacher columns provide information about the rules operating in the two special education classrooms at Central (V and W).

The data reported in the bottom row of the table (labeled "To-tal") indicate that there was considerable variation in the number of rules identified in the classrooms. The range was from 70 rules (Classroom N) to 31 rules (Classroom U). The mean number of rules for the entire school was 47.8, and the median was 43.

The total number of rules in each classroom also indicates that there was a relationship between grade level and number of rules. In grades K-3 (Classrooms M, N, and S) the average number of rules was 58.



Table 3.1

# Cross-Class Rules Analysis: Total Number of Rules by Category and Teacher

	TEACHER/GRADE										
RULE CATEGORY	M K-1	N - K-1	S 2	P 4	0 3-4	R 4	Q 5	T 5-6	U 5-6	V 1-6	₩ 1-6
Procedural	32	27	13	15	-10	17,	13	וו	6	6	18
Academic	9	14	8	11	16	16	13	18	13	12	- !7
Talking & Noise	2	6	5	2	3	7	5	11	3	5	3
Mobility "	8	6	3	2	0	2	į	1	1	2	1
Ethical 💰	0 .	5	2	2	2	4	3	0 ;	3	7	7
Miscellaneous	4	7	6	4	1	3	1	1	3,	13	3
School-Imposed	7.	- 5	5	7	<b>,</b> 4	9	3	6	2	9	4
TOTAL	62	70	42	43	36	58	39	48	31	54	43

\*Special education class

In contrast, the average was 39 for the fifth- and sixth-grade class-rooms (0, T, and U). The number of rules in the two special education classrooms was near the mean for the school (Classroom V, 54, and Classroom W, 43).

Several patterns within each of the domains are noteworthy. In all classrooms, procedural and academic rules predominated. In addition, procedural rules received more emphasis, at least in terms of frequency, in the K-1 classrooms (M and N) than in the other classrooms. At the beginning of the school year, Teachers M and N introduced 32 and 27 procedural rules respectively. In contrast, the other nine teachers introduced fewer procedural rules. For these nine classrooms the median number of rules classified as procedural was 13, with a high of 18 and a low of 8.

Within the mobility category, Teachers M and N also introduced more mobility rules (8 and 6 respectively) than teachers in grades 3-6 who had no more than 2 mobility rules.



A different pattern was evident within the ethical domain. In most of the classrooms only a few ethical rules were identified during the analysis of the narrative descriptions. However, in the two special education classrooms (V and W), seven rules were classified as ethical. It is not clear why more ethical rules were established in these classes, but the need to establish students' respect for one another may have influenced the types of rules that were applied.

Finally, it should be noted that in the upper grades the academic domain accounted for a greater portion of the rules than at the lower grades. Across grades K-2 (Classrooms M, N, and S) 31 of the 174 rules (17.8 percent) were classified as academic. In grades 3-4 (Classrooms P, O, and R), the academic domain accounted for 31.4 percent of the rules (43 of 137), while in grades 5-6 (Classrooms Q, T, and U), the corresponding percentage was 37.3 (44 of 118). Thus there was a linear relationship between grade level and proportion of rules focusing on academic concerns. As students proceeded through Central School they appeared to encounter rule systems with a heavier academic focus. This is consistent with the findings reported later that the general student role demands remained fairly constant across classes at Central School. Hence students would be expected to need less enforcement of procedural rules as they grew older, allowing more attention to other norms of behavior.

In sum, Table 3.1 suggests several trends in the numbers and categories of classroom rules at Central School. There was an inverse relationship between grade level and total number of rules; that is, the rule lists in the upper grades contained fewer rules than the rule lists in the lower grades. At all grade levels, most of the rules were classified as either academic or procedural. There was a greater emphasis on academic rules in the upper grades.

### Analysis of Rules Within Categories

Having provided an initial cross-class analysis of the total number of rules in each category at Central School, we turn now to analysis of the types of rules in each of the seven rule categories. Results are reported in terms of the following questions: What are the subcategories of rules in each domain? what do these rules suggest, about the student role in the various classrooms? and, which rules were widespread across classes and which were idiosyncratic?

As discussed earlier in the data analysis section, the subcategories were formed by grouping rules that were similar in meaning or purpose. When a rule could not be matched with a previously identified rule, it was added to the list of rules for a particular major category. The result was a set of <u>different</u> subcategories of rules for each of the seven rule categories.

It should be noted that the results to be reported may underestimate the extent to which there was overlap in the rule systems operating in the 11 classrooms at Central School. As was described

earlier, a rule was not coded as a rule unless one of the following was evident: (1) The teacher stated the rule; (2) The teacher sanctioned students in relation to specific behavior so that it was easy to label the rule that was being violated; or (3) At the verification analysis session, the teacher added a rule that he or she believed was in operation and important to understanding his or her instructionalsocial system. Because of this operational procedure, the absence of a rule for a particular teacher may not mean that this particular rule was not applied in that classroom. A rule may not have surfaced during the beginning of school observations because the teacher did not state it publicly or no violation of the rule occurred. In addition. some teachers may have had rules in their classrooms which they did not communicate explicitly because they felt the students were totally familiar with them. Other teachers, especially in the lower grades, may have decided that it was important to explain rules as explicitly as possible and thus had higher numbers of coded rules than other teachers.

Appendix B presents the rule lists for each of the seven cate-gories of rules. In these figures, the rules are grouped, first, according to category and, second, according to subcategory. The subcategories are arranged in accord with the number of rules in each; subcategories with the most rules are listed first. Within each subcategory, the rules are arranged in accord with the number of teachers who applied the rule; thus rules shared by a large number of teachers are listed first, and idiosyncratic rules are listed last. In all, 271 different rules were identified and placed on the lists.

### Procedural Rules

Of the 271 rules that were introduced during the beginning of the school year at Central School, 85 were classified as procedural. In other words, roughly one-third of the rules identified at Central School placed demands on student behavior that were not specifically instructional. Examination of these 85 rules revealed they fell into 8 subcategories. These subcategories are presented in Appendix B (Figures 1 to 8) and are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Material Use. The largest subcategory of procedural rules contained rules defining the proper use of materials; 23 rules are in this subcategory (see Appendix B, Figure 1). Ten of the 11 teachers had rules in this subcategory; Teacher U was the only exception.

The most common rule, shared by six teachers, instructed students to place their personal belongings in their cubbies or, less often, in their desks. This rule was nearly uniform in the six classes; for example, "Keep all your materials in your cubby," and "Personal belongings are supposed to be kept in desk or cubby." Personal property was the topic of two rules mentioned in five classes. These concerned storage of coats and lunches. Lunches and coats were generally to be put in cubbies. One other rule was mentioned five times. It concerned distribution and proper use of school-supplied materials, such as crayons and pencils. The only other procedural

rule operative in more than one class also concerned lunches. In this case the placement of empty lunch boxes was designated. Thus the most common rules in this subcategory regulated the use of personal possessions; in particular, those possessions students brought to school, such as lunches and coats.

The remaining 18 rules under the materials use subcategory were idiosyncratic; that is, only one teacher mentioned a particular rule. While the more common rules generally dealt with personal belongings, these idiosycratic rules dealt with school property and supplies, such as the tower in the kindergarten, pencils, books, balls, and glue.

<u>Leaving and Entering the Room</u>. The second largest subcategory of procedural rules focused on procedures for entering and leaving the classrooms (see Appendix B, Figure 2). Eight of the 11 teachers stated rules governing student movement in and out of the room.

The most common rule, which was employed in five classrooms, defined use of the bathrooms. For example, Teacher M stated, "Only one person at a time may use the bathroom," and Teacher S said, "Pupils may go to the bathroom without asking."

Four classrooms had a rule governing students' dismissal from the classroom. Teacher P stipulated that 'students were "not to leave until dismissed by the teacher." Teacher V's rule was similar, "Students shouldn't leave the classroom without the teacher's permission."

Other rules in force in more than one class involved lining up outside the class before entering and proper decorum when entering the class. These rules were found only in the first two grades. Another rule, applied by two teachers, regulated movement from one class-room to another. Finally, the two special education teachers had a rule requiring students to arrive at class on time.

There were six idiosyncratic rules in this subcategory. Four of them involved behavior in the classes of Teacher M and Teacher N. These rules concerned specific features of bathroom use and lining up procedures.

Use of Chairs. Teachers at Central School had 12 rules defining proper use of chairs and the governance of sitting (see Appendix B, Figure 3). The most common rule defined what students should do with chairs when they were not in use. For example, Teacher S told students to "tuck in your chair," while Teacher O stated that "chairs should be stacked after school." Two other rules regulated students' access to "special" chairs: rocking chairs (Teachers M, S, and W) and "black" chairs (Teachers U and T).

Five teachers employed rules regarding seating during films. In general, students were required to sit on the floor for the films, as the movies were screened in the center of the clusters where there were no chairs. Teacher U allowed students to use chairs under special circumstances.



17

Child of the Day. Nine rules governed the child of the day program in the classes of Teachers M and N (see Appendix B, Figure 4). These rules explained how the child of the day was selected in each room and listed the duties, or privileges, of the chosen student.

Class Meeting. Most teachers at Central School held class meetings and a number of procedural rules governed the conduct of these meetings (see Appendix B, Figure 5). Perhaps because each class had different needs during the meetings and different procedures for their conduct, most of these rules were idiosyncratic.

Participation. Eight rules, all idiosyncratic, governed when and how students were to participate in class activities (see Appendix B, Figure 6). These rules included how to talk to the teacher at certain times or for certain reasons, explained that one's initials on the board meant a penalty, and outlined the procedures for playing games in Teacher W's room.

Cleanup. Rules governing cleanup were present in all classrooms but one, that of Teacher U (see Appendix B, Figure 7). All teachers but the fifth- and sixth-grade teachers (Teachers Q, T, and U) insisted that students clean up their own materials. This was the most common procedural rule across all classrooms. In kindergarten, Teacher M expected her pupils to "clean up your stuff," while in fourth grade Teacher R told her students to "clean off desks at [the] end of reading period. [At the end] of [the day], check all areas, put things in desk . . . " A second clean-up rule extended clean-up responsibility from one's own desk and work area to the whole classroom. Five teachers imposed this rule. Teacher S said, "See if other cleanup is needed and do it"; Teacher O stated, "Children should pick up books and arrange them neatly on shelves." Another rule, held by four teachers, stated that students should keep their desks neat and clean, and that they should not mark on them.

, Three cleanup rules were idiosyncratic, again, present only in the classes of Teachers M and N. In fact, these rules might be considered subrules of those just discussed, as they were specific about when to clean up or where to put waste material.

Snacks. The final procedural subcategory regulated snacks (see Appendix B, Figure 8). Although there were only six such rules listed, they were present in every class but Teachers O's, U's, and V's. The most common of these rules stated when students might obtain a drink of water. Five teachers had such regulations. Teacher S's statement that students "may get a drink without asking" was typical, although two teachers cited certain times when students were not to visit the drinking fountain.

The remaining rules in this subcategory governed the formal taking of snacks; that is, food eaten at recess time that was provided either by the school or by the students. These rules defined the place to eat the food, the time, and, for Teachers M and N, additional regulations that seemed to be suggested by special management requirements intrinsic to classrooms containing younger students (first grade and kindergarten).

<u>Summary</u>. These subcategories were discussed in an order determined by the number of rules in each subcategory. The order does not imply order of importance; for example, as noted above, the most widespread procedural rule concerned cleanup and was contained in a subcategory with few cross-class rules and few idiosyncratic rules. The largest subcategory, use of materials, had a few widespread rules and many idiosyncratic regulations. This suggests that, while the teachers had consensus on rules for cleanup, many procedures for using materials reflected special conditions and needs of individual teachers.

Similarly we found consensus on regulation of some aspects of chair use, the number of students in a bathroom at one time, obtaining a drink of water, and eating snacks. On the other hand, rules for participation in class meetings, while common across classes, suggested no consensus, but reflected the idiosyncratic nature of these meetings in each classroom.

Of the 85 procedural rules indentified at Central School, only 12 were introduced in 5 or more of the classrooms. As already noted, the most commonplace, introduced in eight rooms, concerned cleaning up one's own materials. Two other rules were introduced in 6 classrooms; the rules regulating use of cubbies and chairs. Like the clean-up rule, these two rules tended to be present in the lower grades, but absent in the upper grades. This suggests that the upper-grade teachers may have felt that these rules were understood, or that students adhered to these rules with no need for monitoring by the teacher.

Nine other rules appeared in 5 of the 11-rule lists. Several of these rules resembled the two rules discussed in the previous paragraph in that they dealt with the issue of where materials should be kept in the classroom; for example, specifying where coats belonged and describing the appropriate placement of chairs in the classroom. Other widely adopted rules focused on seating arrangements at various times of the day; for example, how and where students were supposed to sit during movies, or seating arrangements during other activities.

It should be noted that 46 procedural rules were idiosyncratic to particular classrooms. Most of these unique rules were introduced by either Teacher M, N, or W. This is not surprising since, as was reported in Table 3.1, these three teachers had the largest number of procedural rules (M, 32; N, 27; and W, 18). Of the 46 idiosyncratic procedural rules, Teacher M introduced 15; Teacher N, 11; and Teacher W, 8. Thus the two K-1 classrooms accounted for 26 of the 46 idiosyncratic procedural rules. As noted above, many of the idiosyncratic rules governed unique activities, such as Teacher M's list of rules for the "Child of the Day." Similarly, 4 of the 8 idiosyncratic rules introduced by Teacher W provided guidelines for activities which did not occur in other classrooms ("sharing goods" and "games day").

In general, within all procedural subcategories, the kindergarten and first-grade teachers, Teachers M and N, provided specific detail, while more general principles sufficed in the higher grades. For example, in the fifth grade, Teacher Q 's only clean-up rule required



students to "put their books away when they were through with them." In contrast, Teachers M and N had five clean-up rules, including details not noted by other teachers: "When bell rings, clean up"; "Children place cups in the sink when done"; and "All disposables are to be thrown in garbage." Except for rules about books, specific rules about what to put where and when were found only in these two classes.

The results of the student participation data collected at Central suggest several implications for student behavior based on the procedural rules. Students at Central School needed to be aware of a large number of procedural rules, especially in the K-l cluster of Teachers M and N. Approximately one-third of the rules at Central were procedural and, in the cases of Teachers M and N, students were governed by 32 and 27 procedural rules respectively. Competent participation, then, required the ability and willingness to conform to a large number of nonacademic procedures.

At the same time, there was a core of procedural rules which were operational in most of the classrooms at Central School. The most common procedural rules focused on issues such as cleaning up, seating arrangements, and the placement of objects in the classroom. The substantial overlap among expectations within this area made the adjustment to new classrooms at the beginning of the year easier for students who had been at Central School in previous years. Rather than learning a whole new set of procedural rules, these seasoned students were already familiar with many of the expectations teachers introduced at the beginning of the year. This familiarity with expectations common to the entire faculty may account for the fact that several of the most frequently mentioned procedural rules did not appear in the rule lists of the fifth- and sixth-grade teachers (Q, T, and U). These upper-grade teachers may not have felt the need to reiterate the basic and most common procedural rules since the students already voluntarily adhered to them.

Nevertheless, students did have to learn a large number of procedural rules in several of the classrooms. For example, Teacher W introduced a number of procedural expectations which were probably new even to students who had been at Central School for several years. Similarly, students in Classrooms M and N were exposed to a large number of idiosyncratic rules. These K-l students may have found it difficult to adjust to a second-grade teacher who did not use many of the procedures adopted by Teachers M and N. That is, it is likely that previous K-l students had to ignore or forget a large number of procedural rules when they entered the second grade at Central School.

If we assume that the existence of a rule suggests the existence of an area of classroom participation in which students were not readily performing as desired, attention to the subcategories and to both rules that agree and rules that diverge is instructive. Cleaning up, use of chairs, storage of personal materials, drinking water, and eating snacks suggest areas where teachers felt student behavior required regulation. Teachers established rules to govern situations that were particular to each individual classroom, but the common rules established suggest that a consensus -- informal or formal --

existed. The storage of personal belongings in cubbies, the use of the bathroom, the drinking of water, and cleaning up were common issues. The large number of idiosyncratic rules, as noted, also suggests the existence of unique attributes of various classes, the need for detailed rules in the early grades, and a lack of consensus about what behavior to require in class meetings, during films, etc. Hence, to function successfully in a particular class, a student needed to sort out and respond to both cross-class and class-specific procedural requirements.

#### Academic Rules

Rules in the second major category define the requirements for student participation in academic matters. Of the 271 different rules which were introduced by the 11 teachers, 61 were classified as academic. In other words, roughly one-fourth of the rules identified at Central School prescribed student behavior in instructional situations. Appendix B (Figures 9 through 15) provides information regarding the extent to which these 61 academic rules appeared in more than one classroom. These academic rules fall into 6 subcategories, with 4 miscellaneous academic rules that did not fit into any one subcategory. The following paragraphs discuss the rules in these subcategories.

Work Behavior. The largest subcategory of academic rules concerned regulations governing actual work on academic tasks (see Appendix B, Figure 9). Ten teachers had at least one academic rule in this subcategory. There was broad consensus on a number of rule areas, reflecting academic issues that were foci of mutual concern. The most common rule area, enforced by eight teachers, concerned writing in journals. Teacher M insisted on students "writing neatly," and Teachers N, P, and Q agreed. Other teachers added stipulations about time spent on writing and the need for a date on each entry. While Teacher S only stated "Students can choose when they will write in their journals," Teacher R's rule list was more detailed:

Journals are private; no one is to read another person's journal without permission except the teacher. The date is to be written on journal page every day. If one day's writing does not fill a page, students are to skip a line, put the date and start the next entry. Students are to write on both sides of the page. Entries are to be made every day. Teacher will collect some days to check for quality.

Seven teachers had academic rules related to spelling. Six required the students to make a personal dictionary in which the teacher wrote difficult words. The seventh teacher required students to consult a published dictionary to find word spellings.

Six teachers established a rule indicating that "Students are expected to read during silent reading." As there were no rules stating,



21

for example, "Students should do Math during math," we assume that many students may not have read during Silent Reading, thus requiring the rule.

Five teachers imposed a rule regulating the use of cursive handwriting. The teachers of fourth-graders, Teachers 0 and R, required "students [to] always write in cursive." Teacher 0 refined this to allow students who had not yet learned to do cursive writing to use printing. Interestingly, the fifth- and sixth-grade teachers, Teachers U and T, were not so demanding. Both exempted students from using cursive writing during spelling tests, and Teacher T exempted all tests. Thus, the rules regarding handwriting appeared to differ by grade level. However, the students seemed to prefer to use printing rather than cursive writing at all grade levels.

Most of the remaining 25 work behavior rules were idiosyncratic. A few were present in two classes. Teacher M had four rules; all concerned the use of paint. Teacher O had seven idiosyncratic rules, some of which were hortatory and vague, such as, "Students are supposed to complete homework assignments," and "Homework should not be crumpled." Others were more detailed: "When using nonconsumable textbooks, assignments are to be done on a separate piece of paper."

It seems appropriate that the majority of the work-behavior rules concerned the undertaking and completion of academic tasks. Similarly, it is not surprising that there were many idiosyncratic rules in this subcategory as teachers varied in their approaches to instruction and therefore had different participation requirements. It is worth noting that in the basic academic areas -- Reading, Math, Social Studies, and formal spelling lessons -- there were no explicit rules that were observed in operation. The reason for this is unclear, but it suggests that instruction in these areas was similar across the classes and so required little observable shaping of students' participation in assigned work.

Finishing Work. Ten teachers had at least one rule concerned with finishing work (see Appendix B, Figure 10). The absence of such rules in Teacher M's class may be explained by the fact that these kindergarten youngsters were not required to complete much work at the beginning of the school year. In the other classes, the teachers' requirement that work be completed was the most common rule.

The second most common work completion rule governed procedures for submitting or filing of completed work. Eight teachers had such regulations, usually requiring completed work to be placed in folders or boxes. The wording of these rules tended to be precise, for example, Teacher S's instruction that, "Completed work goes in the orange bin on the teacher's desk. Be sure your name is on your paper."

One other rule in this subcategory, shared by several teachers, concerned what further assignments students were to begin when their assigned work was completed. Four teachers, P, R, T, and W, addressed this issue. Teacher T stated, "If finish assignment early, students are to work on another assignment or read a book." Teacher R advised

a vague, if creative, approach: "When finish work, students are to exercise skill in finding things to do."

There were five idiosyncratic rules in this subcategory suggesting individual teacher's concerns with details of completing work.

Starting Work. Commencing of academic tasks comprised a third subcategory of academic rules (see Appendix B, Figure 11). Here the most commom rule called on the students to begin by writing their names on their papers. Only Teacher M (whose kindergartners might not be expected to be able to write their names at the beginning of the year), and Teachers S and V did not state such a rule. Most teachers also insisted that the date be placed on the paper.

Interacting with the Teacher. Students' need to obtain the attention of and help from the teacher and their methods for doing so seemed to be a prevalent classroom concern (see Appendix B, Figure 12). Ten teachers (all but Teacher M) had at least one rule in this area. The most common rule exhorted the students to listen to the teacher, as Teacher P said:

Students should listen to directions and follow without asking the teacher. Students are to pay attention when the teacher is reading, giving instructions, asking question, other students are answering questions, or telling stories. Watch the teacher when demonstrations are being given.

#### Teacher U stated:

Students are not to come up to the teacher and interrupt her while she is instructing. Wait until the teacher is finished.

A second rule in this subcategory that also defined appropriate interaction with the teacher required the students to raise their hands if they wanted to talk to the teacher. Six teachers across all grade levels explicitly stated this rule. Another rule, stated by five teachers, indicated students should not interrupt the teacher when the teacher was working with other students. Several teachers mentioned reading conferences, in particular, as a time when they should not be interrupted. Based on the interaction rules, it appeared that students at Central School were expected to listen to directions without interrupting, raise their hands to ask questions, and wait their turn for help from the teacher.

If followed, such rules should facilitate teacher monitoring of many students' work during a particular work period and provision of help to students who most need it. They also supported the small-group learning activities several teachers employed.

Taking a Test. Six teachers had rules governing tests (see Appendix B, Figure 13). The limited number of such rules may reflect

the earliness of the school year and a subsequent lack of testing. It is worth noting that the lower-grade teachers, M, N, and S, did not establish test rules during the beginning of the year. For those who did, the most common rule required students to work alone; the second most common rule stated that students should not begin work until told to do so. Three other rules were idiosyncratic.

Working in a Group. The final academic behavior rule subcategory governed group work procedures (see Appendix B, Figure 14). The three lower-grade teachers, Teachers M, N, and S, and a special education teacher, Teacher V, had rules in this subcategory. For the most part, the early introduction of these group-specific rules reflected the existence of activity centers in these lower grades.

<u>Miscellaneous Rules</u>. There were four rules that could not be grouped meaningfully into any of the above academic subcategories (see Appendix B, Figure 15).

Summary. Academic rules at Central School centered on the completion of work and interactions between students and the teacher. Certain student behaviors were established to facilitate smooth completion of the work. For example, students were required to listen, raise their hands, not interrupt, put their names on their papers, and place completed work in designated places. Teachers also appeared to be concerned with procedures for doing journals and obtaining the correct spelling of words. In addition, the upper-grade teachers recognized students' reluctance to use cursive handwriting and established rules in this regard.

As with the procedural rules, some academic rules were specific and some were general goals. For example, many teachers had specific rules about Where completed work was to be placed, as discussed above. Some stated goals such as, "Finished products should have no errors," and "Even if something is hard, keep trying to do it."

Roughly two-thirds of the academic rules were unique to particular classrooms. These 42 idiosyncratic rules were not distributed equally across the 11 classrooms; that is, there were divergent numbers of idiosyncratic academic rules that were specific to a given classroom. Teachers P, Q, R, and S each had less than three idiosyncratic rules, while Teacher T introduced 8 unique rules, and Teachers M and V had 6 unique rules each.

When this variability is examined, it is evident that a number of these idiosyncratic rules pertained to academic activities that occured in only the one classroom. In the case of Teacher M, four academic rules were designed to regulate student behavior during painting activities. Teacher N had three idiosyncratic academic rules providing guidelines for working at the centers in his classroom. Teacher T introduced three unique rules prescribing procedures for using "packets." Many of the other idiosyncratic academic rules refered to particular aspects of the curriculum, e.g., Cooking, Journals, and Spellaing.

The implications of the academic rules for student participation are somewhat similar to the ones presented in the previous discussion of procedural rules. In some classes, students were required to adapt to a large number of academic rules. Rules ranged from specific to vague and defined expectations, some of which were reasonable, and some of which were not.

Adaptation to expectations within the academic area probably was facilitated by the fact that there were several rules that regulated student behavior in many classrooms. The existence of a core of widely adopted academic rules undoubtedly increased the possibility that students who had been at Central School in previous years were not asked to learn a whole new set of academic expectations. Because seasoned students were familiar with the common academic rules, their transition from grade to grade should have been successful.

Nevertheless, at the beginning of the school year, students at Central School were exposed to 42 classroom-specific academic rules. To participate successfully, all students thus had to adapt to some new rules.

#### Talking and Noise Rules

Within the talking and noise rule category, the Central School faculty introduced 23 rules. These rules are listed in Appendix B, Figures 16-19. Analysis revealed 4 subcategories: talking during academic work, talking during nonacademic work, other general student talking (those rules always applicable), and talking-to-the-teacher rules. The first subcategory contained approximately half the talking and noise rules. Each subcategory is discussed below.

Talking During Academic Work. Regulation of talking during work time is traditionally a major concern of teachers, and the rules devised by the teachers at Central School suggest that they shared this concern (see Appendix B, Figure 16). For example, in six classrooms, students could not talk when the teacher or another student was reading a story. Teacher T's statement of this rule was typical: "Students are to pay attention and 'keep the peace' when teacher or other students are reading aloud."

A second rule regarding talk during academic work also was employed by six teachers. The wording varied, but the essence was that students were to work quietly. Talking was permitted so long as it did not disturb others. In Teacher N's first-grade classroom the rule was stated as:

Children are to work quietly at centers. Talking is permitted only if it does not distract anyone.

In Teacher T's sixth grade the rule was similar:



35

Quiet talk is allowed during work time unless teacher hears [a] voice across the room that is too loud. (This included yelling as well as loud talk.)

Other academic-talking rules prohibited talk during silent reading and class meetings. Five teachers enforced the former and four teachers, the latter. The reader will recall that the teachers had procedural and academic rules concerning participation in class meetings and the necessity to read during silent reading. The academic-talking rules represent yet another effort to ensure proper student participation during these academic activities.

The six remaining academic talk rules were in force in only two classes or were idiosyncratic. All but one of these rules regulated talking during specific classroom activities, such as movies, sharing, testing, and so on. One, in Teacher V's class, stated that the "teacher will not start lesson until class is quiet."

Talk During Nonacademic Work. Five rules were employed that restricted talk during nonacademic times of day (See Appendix B, Figure 17); all but one were idiosyncratic. Teachers M's and N's class-rooms insisted on quiet in the tower. Two rules, also lower-grade rules, called for quiet during rest time. The two remaining nonacademic talk rules comprised Teacher T's insistence on quiet in the classroom before dismissal and Teacher V's directive, "Don't turn on the radio."

General Talking Rules. Six rules attempted to restrict noise at all times of the day (see Appendix B, Figure 18). For the most part, these rules were loosely structured, allowing liberal considerations for differences of opinion and teacher-student negotiation of appropriate behavior. Three teachers prohibited yelling in the classroom. Two teachers stated specific punishments if students were "too noisy." For example, Teacher R indicated that, "Students can sit where they want unless they get too noisy." Teacher T said, "When students are too noisy, the teacher will count. If the count reaches five, students stay in an extra five minutes at recess, lunch, or after school." The three remaining rules, all idiosyncratic, also focused on limiting noise in the classrooms.

Talking to the Teacher. Rules in this subcategory were similar to those in the academic rule subcategory, "Interacting with the Teacher." However, the rules listed here designated the interactions that were appropriate during nonacademic activities (see Appendix B, Figure 19). Again, as during academic work, the major thrust was that students were to listen when the teacher gave instructions (seven classrooms).

Summary. Five of the 24 talking and noise rules that were identified at Central School were introduced by 5 or more teachers. They involved restrictions on talking while the teacher was giving instructions, during story time, while working, during silent reading, and



26

during class meetings. They represented a widespread consensus about acceptable interaction in the classroom.

Approximately half of the talking and noise rules (13 of 23) were singular to one teacher's list of rules. There was some variability as to the extent to which individual teachers introduced idiosyncratic talking and noise rules. All the rules introduced by Teachers M, O, P, U, and V were similar to those employed by at least one other teacher. They had no idiosyncratic talking and noise rules. In contrast, Teacher T had 4 idiosyncratic rules, and Teacher S had three such rules.

These results suggest that the students should have had little trouble learning the talking and noise requirements at Central School. In contrast to the procedural and academic categories, this category contained fewer rules. In addition, many rules were familiar to students who had been at Central School in previous years. If students had trouble adapting to the talking and noise regulations, it would seem that this would have been most likely to occur in Classrooms S and T, since these teachers introduced more idiosyncratic rules than the other teachers.

### Mobility Rules

Nineteen mobility rules were identified. They are listed in Appendix B, Figures 20-22. There were few common mobility rules across the classrooms at Central School. Sixteen of the 19 rules appeared in a single classroom; half were introduced in the K-l classrooms (Teachers M and N). This finding at first appears paradoxical, given the fact that students in these classrooms had considerable freedom to move about. Apparently, with more opportunity to move, there also was a need for specific quidelines and restrictions.

Three subcategories of mobility rules were identified. The first contained rules designed to regulate movement around the classroom. The second included rules that controlled movement on furniture and apparatus. The final subcategory was concerned with physical contact among the students.

Classroom Movement. One rule in this subcategory was noted by Teachers M, R, and V. It required students to "sit" when they entered the room. The other rules varied from teacher to teacher. The following examples provide a general sense of the areas of emphasis: "Go to the desks for lights-out rest period," "No handsprings in the classroom," and "Students may not move desks at random, must have teacher permission."

<u>Specialized Equipment</u>. These rules concerned use of apparatus in the classroom and were found only in Teachers M's and N's room (see Appendix A, Figure 21). Four of the seven rules concerned use of the "tower," a special piece of furniture constructed to provide sitting areas at various levels where students could sit to read and do other work.

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

Physical Contact. Three rules restricted students' physical contact (see Appendix A, Figure 22). They involved requirements such as "Students do not touch each other" so they must "leave spaces between themselves and the next person in line."

Summary. The 19 mobility rules discussed above suggest that, while movement was an issue of some import at Central School, acceptable behavior took different forms in different classrooms.

Overall, the mobility rules indicated that once students had left the first few grades at Central School they should have had few problems understanding the teachers' mobility expectations. Teachers in grades 3-6 introduced few explicit restrictions on the mobility of students during the beginning of the school year. This suggests that the students at Central School already were aware of these rules by the time they reached third grade and generally obeyed them. As a result, the teachers in the upper grades were not required to sanction students with respect to mobility or to establish explicit regulations.

In contrast, adapting to mobility rules appeared to more of a problem for students in grades K, 1, and 2. Thus, it may be necessary for teachers at these grade levels to establish the standards that pertain for the rest of the students' schooling experience at Central School.

## Ethical Rules

Seventeen ethical rules were introduced by teachers at Central School. These rules fall into three subcategories: courtesy to other students, respect for teacher, and resolution or prevention of conflicts. The following paragraphs examine these subcategories.

Courtesy to Other Students. Manners, or courtesy and the maintainance of smooth interpersonal relations with other students was the focus of 11 of the 17 ethical rules that were established (see Appendix B, Figure 23). The most common rule in this subcategory regulated belittling of other students. For example, Teacher P's rule stated, "Do not 'put down' other students." Teacher U said, "Students are not to be disrespectful to the other children." A total of five teachers had a rule of this type.

In addition, three teachers established rules regarding respect for the property of other students (Teachers Q, S, and U). Teachers N, R, and V asked students not to interfere with others while they worked. Other rules in this subcategory exhorted students not to compare their work with others' and established guidelines for the sharing of food during snack times.

Respect for the Teacher. Four idiosyncratic rules were established relative to respect for the teacher (see Appendix B, Figure 24). These rules were imposed by the two teachers who worked with learning disabled students. Teacher V had three such rules: "Students are not to question the teacher's authority," "Students are to admit rule

violations," and "Students are not to tattle." Teacher W prohibited the students from asking him to tell them about other students' problems -- Information he would not reveal. These four rules appear to be attempts by these teachers to instill in their students the classroom norms students in other classes may have already assimilated.

Resolution and Prevention of Conflict. Three rules addressed the issue of conflict between students (see Appendix B, Figure 25). One rule that occurred in six classrooms prohibited pushing, hitting, jabbing, and shoving. For example, "Children must not hit each other, push or shove," "Jabbing another student is unacceptable," and "Do not push one another." The second conflict rule urged students to solve their problems verbally, without arbitration by the teacher. As Teacher U put it, "Students are to settle their own conflicts." Three teachers stated this rule. The final conflict rule was established by Teacher M and stated that she was available to help settle problems if students' verbal efforts failed.

These rules suggest that students at Central School were expected to get along with their peers, respect the property of other people, and respect the teacher's authority. The rules established in the learning-disabled classes further indicate that students in these two classrooms were less able or less willing to conform to ethical expectations than the typical student.

## School-Imposed Rules

Appendix B, Figures 26-30, presents the school-imposed rules introduced at Central School. These rules dealt primarily with students' behavior outside the classroom where they were not under the direct supervision of their classroom teacher. Since several of the school-imposed rules were clarified and revised during the debriefing meeting held with the teachers, and many of the rules probably were introduced and enforced in contexts which were not witnessed by the observers, in many cases, the rules that appear on a rule list in Appendix B are because the teacher felt it was necessary to let students know of the existence of that particular rule during a class discussion. This may account for the unexpected idiosyncratic nature of the school-imposed rules.

Five subcategories of school-imposed rules were identified. The first included rules about recess, and the second concerned deportment, Each of these subcategories comprised eight rules. In addition, six other school-imposed rules regulated students' behavior before school. The final two subcategories dealt with the absence of adults and the duties of parents. The following paragraphs delineate each of these subcategories.

Recess. Recess was a time during the day when large numbers of children were together. Therefore, crowd-control problems arose and rules were required. In addition, since the students were not likely to be under the supervision of their classroom teacher, rules that

were school-wide rather than idiosyncratic with each teacher are to be expected in this subcategory.

All recess rules defined correct behavior on the playground. The most common rule prohibited students from running to recess and stipulated that students should not run anywhere on the school grounds "except on the grassy area." Five teachers, from kindergarten to sixth grade, stated this rule.

A second recess rule actually was a subrule of the previous one. It prohibited running on the blacktop (the asphalt area of the playground). This rule was mentioned by Teachers N, P, and R. The third recess rule, stated by Teachers N and P, reminded students not to play on the hillside behind the school that bordered the school property. Five other recess rules were stated by only one teacher (see Figure 26).

Deportment. This subcategory of school-imposed rules compliments the courtesy subcategory of ethical rules and deals with manners on a school-wide basis (see Appendix B, Figure 27). The most common rule was discussed by 10 teachers (Teacher T being the exception). It centered around gum chewing. A second rule reminded students to flush the toilet. Four teachers, from kindergarten to grade 6. stated this rule. The remaining deportment rules were idiosyncratic; 4 were ararticulated by Teacher R.

Coming to School. The process of arriving at school each day presented a number of problems of management which were addressed by six school-imposed rules (see Appendix B, Figure 28). Three regulated the use of bicycles as a means of transportation. Seven teachers described the school policy that only third-, fourth-, and fifth-graders might ride bicycles to school. Two idiosyncratic rules reminded students not to ride on the blacktop and to lock their bikes.

The other rules in this subcategory dealt with arrival time at school, how to enter the classroom, and what to do on rainy days.

Supervision of Adults. According to the California State Education Code, elementary students always are to be under the supervision of an adult. A group of school-imposed rules dealt with students' inevitable tendency to go places where adults were not present. Seven teachers stated that students should not be in a room unless an adult was there. As examples, Teacher O said, "Students shouldn't be in a cluster without a teacher," while Teacher Q noted that, "No students are supposed to be in the classroom without a teacher." Two idiosyncratic rules faced the same issue of adult supervision, one with regard to use of the telephone in the office and the other, the library.

Parental Responsibilities. Two idiosyncratic rules (see Appendix B, Figure 30) dealt with parents' responsibility for sending a Note to explain a student's absence (Teacher R) and the need for parents to sign and return "emergency cards" (Jeacher T).

Summary. The school-imposed rules emphasized management of students outside of the classroom. The wording of the rules suggests the school's concern for the safety of students. The salience of adult supervision, the prohibition of running in the yard, and the procedures for riding bicycles to and from school stress this aspect of school life.

# Miscellaneous Rules

Thirty-eight rules were classified as miscellaneous (see Appendix B, Figure 31), none of which was shared by more than 2 teachers. These rules covered a diverse set of issues, ranging from classroom behavior to students' personal problems.

Miscellaneous rules were not equally distributed across the 11 teachers. Teacher V had 13 miscellaneous rules, 10 of which appeared in no other rule list. Teachers S and N each had 5 idiosyncratic as miscellaneous rules.

In contrast, Teachers O, P, Q, R, and T had three or less mis-cellaneous rules. Thus, other influencial factors notwithstanding, students in these five classrooms should have had less trouble adapting to their new social-instructional systems than students who were introduced to a large number of miscellaneous rules.



#### CHAPTER FOUR

#### CONCLUSIONS

Interpretation of the findings that are reported herein, regarding the rules that were established in a successful elementary school, requires the reader to keep two characteristics of the data in mind. First, the major data source was observations conducted over the first four days of the school year followed by two additional observation days, two and six weeks later. Hence the rules that were identified were those associated with the initiation of school. Second, the analysis focused on explicit rules that were identifiable because the teachers stated them, sanctioned students' behavior that was not in conformance with them, or both. As a result, classroom norms, expectations, etc., that were followed by the students may have escaped coding, even though they were important features of the classroom instructional-social system. Therefore, the results reported here provide a useful, but somewhat limited, view of the requirements for successful participation by students in Central Elementary School.

# Summary of Findings

Several general conclusions may be drawn from the findings reported in Chapter Three. These are discussed below.

There was evidence of an inverse relationship between grade level and the total number of rules identified in each classroom. As students proceeded through Central School, they were exposed to fewer explicit rules. Thus, it appears that, over time, the students' knowledge increased relative to the ways teachers expected students to participate in classroom activities. That is, students learned more about the student role as they moved from grade to grade. Because of these socialization effects, teachers in the higher grades were required to spend less time making explicit statements about their expectations for student behavior than those in the lower grades. According to this interpretation, rules tended to surface in the upper grades primarily when students violated some aspect of the teacher's implicit definition of competent participation, and the teacher found it necessary to issue a reprimand. This was demonstrated at Central where few rules were placed into operation by the upper-grade teachers through explicit definition and discussion of expected student behavior.

Teachers at the lower grade levels tended to emphasize procedural rules. In addition, in contrast to the upper-grade teachers, these teachers seemed to use a deductive approach to rule-setting. They



tended to state expectations frequently during the first few days of school and actively tried to teach the expected student-role behaviors to their students, rather than using the reactive, inductive style that seemed to be more typical of teachers in the upper grades.

There was a linear relationship between grade level and proportion of rules classified as academic. In other words, there was a greater focus on academic rules in the upper grades than in the lower grades. This finding is not surprising, given the fact that, in comparison to younger children, older students are more capable of spending longer periods of time engaged in academic work and, as discussed in Chapter Three, by the time the students reached the upper grades, they had assimilated most of the procedural aspects of the student role. The features of instruction that changed, based on the teacher to whom they were assigned, were more apt to be specific procedures for carrying out new and perhaps more complex academic tasks than behaviors such as how to enter the classroom or interact with the teacher or other students.

Consistent with the procedural rules findings, teachers in grades K-2 placed greater emphasis on mobility rules than teachers in the other classrooms at Central School. This finding also can be interpreted from a developmental perspective. As children grow older, they find it easier to control their movements. Further, students in the upper grades have a good idea of when they may move around classrooms. They rarely are sanctioned due to inappropriate behavior of this type. In addition, students in the lower grades were allowed more mobility; therefore, more rules were necessary to control this movement. The upper-grade classroom activities tended to be more sedentary, so fewer rules, whether implicit or explicit, were necessary to control the students' movements.

Rules in the ethical category were particularly salient in the classrooms of the two teachers who worked with learning-disabled students. In contrast to the other teachers at Central School, these teachers introduced several ethical rules. This finding suggests that these two teachers made an adaptive response to the educational requirements of their special-needs children. The students in these two classrooms often had difficulty getting along with other students. Consequently, the teachers found it necessary to provide explicit expectations regrding students' respect for one another and the teacher.

The rules that were identified were distributed unevenly among the categories. Of the 271 rules that were identified across all classrooms, roughly one-third were procedural and one-fourth fell into the academic category. Thus more than half the rules were of these two types.

Rules within the seven categories posed different adaptation problems for students as they moved from classroom to classroom at Central School. In general, Central students should have had little trouble understanding the ethical and talking and noise rules introduced by their teachers. These two categories contained few rules,

and most of the teachers established rules which should have been familiar to students who had been at Central School during previous years. Similarly, expectations within the mobility category probably posed few adaptation problems for students once they had completed kindergarten and first grade. On the other hand, each teacher introduced some academic rules that were unique to his or her classroom, thus requiring students to adapt to new ways of participating. To some extent this also was true of the procedural rules. Further, in terms of sheer quantity, the procedural and academic categories may have presented more difficulties for students than the other types of rules. This may have been particularly true for younger students, since their capacity to encode, store, and retrieve such large amounts of situation-specific information was limited, compared to the cognitive abilities of the older students.

The rules at Central School ranged from precise, e.g., "After you use the toilet, flush" to vague, e.g., "When finish work, students are to exercise skill in finding things to do" to hortatory, e.g., "Even if something is hard, keep trying to do it," to difficult to achieve, e.g., "Finished product should have no errors." In addition, some rules reflected immediate expectations, such as flushing toilets or putting names on papers, while others established long-term, continuous goals, e.g., having no errors and being neat. Further, in order to become operative, some rules had to be defined by usage and negotiation between student and teacher. For example, while teachers prohibited yelling and insisted on neatness, the definition of unacceptable yelling and what was meant by neatness could only be determined by experience with a particular teacher.

Finally, the rules established at Central School, in turn, suggest areas of concern at the school and the degree to which the teachers agreed on responses and solutions to these concerns. Table 4.1 lists the rules that were established by more than half the teachers. Almost half of these 11 high-consensus rules involved some aspects of academic behavior. If the three academic-talking rules are added to the rules from the academic category, we find that teachers at Central School expressed substantial consensus on a number of academic matters. These included when students should not talk and how they should obtain the teachers' attention. Teachers also consistently required the students to put their names on their papers, listen to the teacher, finish their work, and place their work in the appropriate place. In these areas, students moving through Central School met consistency of expectations. Three school-imposed rules governing gum chewing, use of bicycles, and presence of adults also had wide consensus, as did procedural rules regarding cleanup, chairs, and storage of matérials.

Other areas of the schooling experience at Central suggested problems to which the teachers responded with a variety of solutions and/or problems that were unique to only one or two classrooms. The subcategories of rules that had large numbers of idiosyncratic rules were in the procedural category and the academic subcategory related to doing work.

Table 4.1
Rules Reflecting Consensus Across Classrooms at Central School

RULE CATEGORY	STUDENT BEHAVIOR TO WHICH RULE IS RELATED	NUMBER OF TEACHERS ESTABLISHING RULE
School-Imposed	Gum chewing restrictions	10
Academic	Write in journals	8
Academic	Required to finish work	8
Academic	Place finished work in specified place	8
Academic	Put name on paper	8
Academic	Listen to teacher and follow directions	8
Procedural	When you make ^a mess, clean it up	8
Academic	Get help with unknown words	- 7 -
School-Imposed	Who can ride bicycles	7
School-Imposed	Requirement of adult supervision	7
Talking and Noise	Listen when teacher gives nonacademic in- structions	. 7
Talking and Noise	Do not talk during story time	6
Talking and Noise	Work quietly so you do not disturb others	6
Procedural	Keep own materials in cubby (storage area)	6
Procedural	Care of chair	6
Academic	Must read during silent reading	6
Academic	During work time, raise your hand if you need help from the teacher	6



The above, then, are the major conclusions that emerged from the analysis of the rules introduced at Central School at the beginning of the school year. The relationships between these findings and those from previous research are discussed next.

# Relationship of Major Findings to Previous Research

As was pointed out in the introduction to this report, this rules analysis serves as a follow-up to a previous investigation conducted by the Far West Laboratory research team. Tikunoff and Ward (1978) investigated the rules established at the beginning of the school year in three classrooms that were in three schools serving student populations that were primarily minority and from low SES families. In contrast, Central School served a predominantly white, middle-class popu-Nonetheless, in the three fourth-grade classrooms studied by Tikunoff and Ward (1978), the distribution of rules across the seven rule categories was similar to the overall pattern found in the present analysis. In both studies, the procedural and academic rules accounted for more than half of the rules that were identified. In addition, both analyses indicated that it was rare for one of the other categories to contain more than 10 rules and the rules that remained after the procedural and academic coding was completed tended to be evenly distributed among the remaining 5 categories.

Also, in 2 of the 3 classrooms studied by Tikunoff and Ward, the total number of rules was comparable to the number of rules identified in each of the 11 classrooms at Central School. One Tikunoff and Ward classroom had a considerably higher number of rules. This convergence suggests that it is typical for an elementary teacher to establish between 40 and 50 rules at the beginning of the school year. It is interesting to note that this finding holds in spite of the demographic differences between the schools. The number of rules did not appear to be influenced by the type of student served. Further, the findings reported in the present inquiry suggest that the teacher in the previous investigation who introduced 135 rules is not typical. In other words, it seems likely that the social-instructional system introduced by this particular fourth-grade teacher in the earlier study was unusually complicated.

In addition to the above similarities in findings, there was one noteworthy difference between the findings reported by Tikunoff and Ward and the results of the school-wide analysis conducted at Central. The earlier study found that academic rules outnumbered procedural rules, while at Central School procedural rules were more prevalent than academic rules. This difference seems to reflect the fact that Tikunoff and Ward studied fourth-grade classrooms, while the present study was conducted in an entire school. Stress on academic rules also occurred in the upper grades at Central School but not in the lower ones. Hence it appears that the earlier results may be applied to other upper-grade classrooms, but not to classrooms at the lower grade levels.

Building from both studies, it appears that a student is required to know and respond to a minimum of some 40 different rules in order to participate appropriately in a typical elementary classroom. Depending upon how long the student remains in the school and how consistent teachers are with regard to the rules that are enforced, appropriate performance of the student role may become easier as the student progresses through school. On the other hand, since many procedural expectations appear to become implicit rather than explicit parts of the instructional-social system in the upper-grade classrooms, adapting to school may be more difficult for upper-grade students who are new to the school than it would be for such students at the lower grades. where the teachers explicitly state and sanction procedural and other behaviors. In any case, the beginning of the school year is a time when the teachers and the students establish the standards under which social interactions, academic work, and procedural activities will be carried out for the remainder of the school year and possibly for several years in the students' educational experience.

### **REFERENCES**

- Barker, R. Ecological psychology: Concepts and methods for studying the environments of human behavior. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1968.
- Bidwell, C. E. Schooling and socialization for moral commitment. Interchange, 1972, 3(4), 1-27.
- Bossert, S. T. Tasks, group management, and teacher control behavior: A study of classroom organization and teacher style. School Review, 1977, 85(4), 552-565.
- Bossert, S. T. <u>Tasks and social relationships in classrooms</u>. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. The experimental ecology of education. <u>Teachers</u> College Record, 1976, 78(2), 157-204.
- Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. <u>Teacher-student relationships: Causes</u> and consequences. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974.
- Charlesworth, W., C., & Bart, W. M. Some contributions of ethology for education. Educational Studies, 1976, 7(3), 258-307.
- Damon, W. The social world of the child. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- DeSoto, C. Everyman as psychologist. <u>Contemporary Psychology</u>, 1979, 24(6), 455-456.
- Doyle, W. Paradigms for research on teacher effectiveness. In L. S. Schulman (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, Vol. 5. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1977.
- Doyle, W. Classroom tasks and students' abilities. In P. Peterson & H. Walberg (Eds.), Research on teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan, 1979(a).
- Doyle, W. The tasks of teaching and learning in classrooms. Austin, Tex.: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1979(b). (Report No. 4103)
- Dreeben, R. The contribution of schooling to the learning of norms. Harvard Educational Review, 1967, 37(2), 211-237.
- Dreeben, R. On what is learned in school. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.
  - Furth, H. Children's societal understanding and the process of equilibration. In W. Damon (Ed.), New directions for child development: Social cognition (Vol. 1). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.



- Gump, P. The classroom behavior setting: Its nature and relation to student behavior. Lawrence, Kan.: University of Kansas, Midwest Psychological Field Station, 1967.
- Hoffman, M. Moral internalization: Current theory and research. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 10). New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Jackson, P. <u>Life in classrooms</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.
- Kounin, J. S. <u>Some ecological dimensions of school settings</u>. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977.
- Mehan, H. <u>Learning lessons</u>. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Parsons, T. The school class as a social system. <u>Harvard Educational</u> Review, 1959, <u>29</u>, 4.
- Philips, S. Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In C. Cazden, V. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), <u>Functions of language in the classroom</u>. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.
- Rhodes, W., & Paul, J. <u>Emotionally disturbed and deviant children</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: <u>Prentice-Hall</u>, 1978.
- Rist, R. Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. <u>Harvard Educational Review</u>, 1970, 40, 411-451.
- Smith, L. M., & Geoffrey, W. <u>The complexities of an urban classroom</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Tikunoff, W. J., & Ward, B. A. <u>Conducting naturalistic research on teaching: Some procedural considerations</u>. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.
- Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., & Griffin, G. <u>Interactive research and development on teaching: Executive summary. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1979.</u>
  (Report IR&DT-79-12)
- Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., Lash, A. A., & Dunbar, C. Study B: A case study of teacher allocation and utilization of classroom teaching/learning time during the teaching of an experimental teaching unit in mathematics. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1980.
- Weiner, B. A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71(1), 3-25.

APPENDIX A
INSTRUCTIONS TO TEACHERS
FOR CODING CLASSROOM RULES



### INSTRUCTIONS TO TEACHER FOR CODING CLASSROOM RULES

Classroom rules are an important facet of any social-instructional system. Social behavior in the classroom is heavily influenced by the rules which have been established by the members of the teaching-learning community. In order to describe and understand what goes on in classrooms, it is necessary to know the rules which regulate the behavior of students. Since you have first-hand knowledge of the norms operating in your classroom, you are in a perfect position to describe these rules.

We all have a fairly good idea of what a classroom rule is. However, in some cases it is difficult for people to decide if a particular expectation should be classified as a classroom rule. It is often helpful to have a formal definition when trying to classify these borderline, ambiguous cases.

We would like to propose the following definition: A classroom rule is a general, normative guideline which specifies the kinds of behavior for which students can be punished or rewarded. There are several things to note about this definition.

First, rules are general expectations which are relevant in more than one particular situation. Rules need to be distinguished from instructions. In contrast to rules, instructions are task-specific. Some examples of instructions are: "Read Chapter 2 in the green book", "Use a pencil to do this assignment", "When you finish, work on your Math." Although students are expected to follow these directions and may be sanctioned if they do not, these expectations are relevant in only one specific situation. They do not apply to other lessons and other days. In contrast, the following should be classified as class-room rules: "Students are supposed to read during silent reading", "Worksheets should never be done with a pen", "Whenever an assignment is completed, go on to another one." These expectations are general and apply to different lessons in different ways.

Second, classroom rules are <u>normative</u> expectations. They refer to behaviors which students should perform. When in doubt, ask the following question: Does this expectation describe what students are suposed to do? If the answer to this question is negative, the expectation should not be classified as a rule.

Third, classroom rules are intimately tied to the notion of liability. They refer to behaviors for which students can be held responsible and, hence, are subject to rewards and punishments. You should not classify an expectation as a classroom rule unless you are willing to reward students who adhere to it and punish those who don't.

It also should be noted that classroom rules need not be explicit. The behavior of students can be shaped by normative expectations which are implicit. For example, we observed that older students at Central School often go to the bathroom or get a drink of water without asking permission. In many cases, these rules were never communicated explicitly.

Hopefully, the formal definition will help identify classroom rules as you read through your protocols. We would like you to make a list of the rules which were introduced during the first four days of school. Enclosed are several sheets of paper which should make the task easier for you.

Whenever you encounter a new rule in one of the protocols, we would like you to highlight it with a yellow pen. Two yellow highlighters are enclosed. A number should be assigned to that rule and this number should be recorded in the far-left column of the enclosed sheets. The information required for each rule should also be recorded. This includes the day (1, 2, 3, or 4) and the page of the protocol. Each rule should receive a brief label (e.g., no talking, listen to instructions, raise hand). A description of the rule should be written in the far-right column. You may also want to include additional information about that particular rule if it strikes you as especially interesting.

As an illustration of the coding procedures, consider the following example. Suppose the following material was encountered on page 5 of the protocol for the third day:

Several students are working on their math assignment.

Teacher says to the class: "I want everyone sitting during snack time."

The first step in the coding involves highlighting the quotation "I want everyone sitting during snack time" with a yellow pen. Next, the number 14 would be placed in the left-hand column of the protocol as indicated above. This indicates that this was the fourteenth rule introduced since the beginning of school.

Next, you would turn to the coding sheet and fill in the required information. The coding would look something like this:

Number	Day	Page	Label	Description
13			- 12k	
: 1,4	3	5	Snack- Sitting	Students are supposed to sit during snack time.
15				• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •



You should also be aware of two other procedural suggestions. First, you should probably use a pencil. You may decide to combine expectations or sub-divide other ones and this will require renumbering the rules which have been previously identified. Second, whenever you are uncertain if an expectation fits the formal definition presented above, you should probably include it as a rule. In other words, we would prefer that your list be too long rather than too short. The observer for your classroom will be independently working on a similar list. Any disagreements between the two lists of rules will be resolved when we meet with you individually to present the results of our analysis.

After you have completed the list of classroom rules, please list any other rules which were introduced after the first four days. We need a complete description of your current social-in-structional system.

APPENDIX B
CHARTS OF TEACHERS' RULES

ACHER GRADE	M K-1	N K-1	, <u>\$</u>	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4 ·	9 5	บ 5-6	۰ _	1 6	y 1-6	u 1=6
P-1	Reep your things in your cubby.	keep all your mater- ials in your cubby.			Personal belongings are sup- posed to be kept in desk or cubby.	liesks are to be work space and cubbtes are to keep things in except lunches,	Personal materials should be in desk or cubby hole.			•	•	Each student will have a cubby and keep supplies in it. Keep supplies in the supply area.
P-2		You are responsible for metting your own supplies.	Take care of cray- onsyou net just one hox all year. May net sup- plies with- out asking. Use mater- ials appro- priately don't throw them, etc.	Students are respon- sible for keeping track of their pen- cils.		Students may take pencils from pen- cil bux without ask- ing; stu- dents only quet one pencil a month, he sure tn put them away; may sharpen without penmission,		•				Have a pen- cil with you always, Keep it in your cubby so that it doesn't get lost,
P-3	If you have a lunch pail, put it in your cubby.	Put lunch in your cubby.		Lunch and all nther food go in the cubbies.		Lunch boxes (hags) go on shelf above coats.	Children should put their lunches in cubby holes.					
P-4	Coats be- lung in coat cubby, if hangers are avail- able, hang them up.	Hang up outer gar- ments in garment cubby.		Jackets are to be hung nver by cub- hies, not on chairs.			Coats should be hund up on coat rack.				Students should keep their cloth- ing off the floor.	
P-5		After lunch recess, line lunch boxes up at the door.	•			Put lunches at quad door,		•				
P-6	Dan't pick up ladder.											

Figure 1: Procedural rules: Material use.



					5			٥		,	
TEACHER GRAUE RULE		N K-1	<u>s</u>	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	0 5	IJ 5-6	† 6	<b>v</b> 1-6	₩ 1-6
P-7	When in tower, keep hands and heads in.								<del></del>	), (1), (2), (3), (4), (4), (4), (4), (4), (4), (4), (4	1-0
P-fi	You may bring your own pens to school,			8		<del></del> ,		. ,		đ	
P-9	Keep sand in the sandhox,	•		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	<u>.</u>			<del></del>	<u> </u>		
P+ 10		Sit behind your lap board. It can be in your lap or on the floor in front of you.									
P-11		Use the smooth sur- face of the lap board.	•				v		<del></del> :	\$** 	
P 12		Pillows can- not be moved from floor to floor.			<u> </u>	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	<del></del>	
	Don't put the pencils in your mouth.			· ·		<u> </u>				· ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
P-14			mu sh	udents st wear nes in the assroom,	ę						

Figure 1. Procedural rules: Material use (cont.)



TEACHER GRADE	М К-1	K-1	\$ 2	P 2-3	() 3-4	R 4	` Q 5	์ บ 5-6	; 6	y , 1-6 .	W 1-6
RHE F P-15	: -			Hall moni- turs will be assigned; there will be a sign up sheet to be a monitor.							
P-16	ی	,	P. C.		Keep books being read in the desk.		-		•		
P-17				. :		Names should be on lunches.					
P-1A	٤	·				No not kick the red halls (hecause they break easily) or the smooth white hall (volley- hall).	,	· ,			,
P- 19				G					No not dam- age equip- ment, facil- ities, etc.		<u> </u>
P-20						_					No not write on note- books.,
P- 71											Get permis- sion from teacher to go into teacher's desk.

57

Figure 1. Procedural rules: Material use (cont.)



Figure 1. Procedural rules: Material use (cont.).



FF ACHER GRADE	M	N K-1	\$ 2	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	() · 5	บ 5-ธ	T 6	y 1-6	N 1-6
RIH E** P=24	Only one person at a time may use the bathroom.		May go to the bath- roum with- out asking,			Only one girl and one boy out of the runm in bathroom at a time (sign up place will know this).			Students may qo to the restroum as necessary; no special permission is needed.	<del>-</del>	Notify the teacher be- fore going to the bathroom.
P-25	Go to re- cess when excused from your center.			Not to leave until dismissed by teacher.				s .	Students may not leave room at re- cess, lunch, end of day, etc., until teacher dis- misses them.	Students shouldn't leave the classroom without the teacher's permission.	
P-26	Line up outside the door near the sandbox.	Line up at the door before school.	Before entering classrow line up in a single line (hoys and girls mixed)	<b>#.</b> -							
P-27	During re- cess, may comm in to up to the bathroom.	You cannot come into the class-room during recess without the teacher's permission unless you are going to the bath-room.	*					,	•		
V-78		Move into the class- room quiet- ly.	Enter class- coum through front door, Malk-don't run-quiet- ly, Go to your desk and get busy,					•			

Figure 2. Procedural rules: Leaving and entering the classroom.



FACHER GRADE	M K-1	N K-1	\$ 2	P 2-3	() 3-4	<b>R</b> 4	0 5	U 5-6	T 6	¥ 1-6	¥ 1-6
RIIL F P-24			Get orderly before com- ing into room,					;	No bubbles.		
P- 30				then move from build- ing to build- ing, stay behind the group leader named by the teacher.				*		Students are supposed to qn as a class from one part of the campus to another.	
P-31	-									Students are sup- posed to come to the class- room on time.	Come to class on time and when sched- uled and leave on time. If late, make time up after school, if early, sit-quiet- ly until time,
u. 32	Don't have to ask permission to go to the bath- room.						•		,		
P-33	Bon't use the staff bathroom,										
P-34		Kindergarteners line up at the front door for dis- missal. Firs graders line at the gate f lunch.	it un		٠.		90 - N				

Figure 2. Procedural rules: Leaving and entering the classroom (cont.).

TEACHER GRADE - RIHE -	M K~]	K-)	\$ ?	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	Q 5		T 6	y 1-6	<b>W</b> 1-6
P- 35		No cutting in line.						-			
P- 36			,	Students are to wait to be excused af- ter the movie.							<b>A</b> 1
P-37						··	<u>-</u>			Students are supposed to qo to re- cess with their home- room,	

Figure 2. Procedural rules: Leaving and entering the classroom (cont.).



TEACHER GRADE RULE	M K-3	N K-1	S 7	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4 ·	η 5	บ 5-6	† 6	V 1-6	W 1-6
P-3R	Krep chairs on the floor. No not tip them or play with them.		Tuck in your chair,	Chairs are to be pushed in when not being used.	Chairs should be stacked.	Put chairs on top of desk side- ways.	Students should put their chairs on top of desks at end of day,				
P- 39	When watch- ing a film, sit appro- priate dis- tance from screen,			Students are to sit up (not lie on floor) dur- ing movie.		•	sit on the floor dur- ing movies (cluster rule).	Everyone should sit on the floor when watching movies. First amend- ment: stu- dents can sit on chairs if they are in the rear	Sit on the floor un- less run- ning the movie (no longer en- forced).		
		· .			-			of the room, Second: chairs can't be farther back than the pro- jector,	,		
P=4r)	Can sit in rocking chair only during ac- tivity time.	Sit on the edge of the blue circle.	Rocking chairs are not allowed in the meet- ing area.		,	Students who sit along edge of reading center may sit at desk during class meetings, Students may lie on the florr as long as they pay attention.					Don't sit on rocking, chair when teacher wants to sit there.

Figure 3. Procedural rules: Use of chairs.

TEACHER GRADE BILL	. H K-1	N K+1	. S 2	P 7-3	0 3-4	R .	Q 5	บ 5-6	T 6	v 1-6	W 1-6
P-41						Students may sit where they choose.	Students should not sit on the hack or arms of the sofa (hack is enforced more fre-	Students are sup- posed to 'sit in their chairs,		•	Don't roughhouse on the couch,
							quently than arms). Rule is en- forced dur- ing meet- ings.				<b>A</b> . •
P-42					Push chairs under desks when not using them,			Any chair taken from a desk must be returned. Put chairs back under your desks,	Chairs must be put back where they belong after used for class or group meet- ing, etc.		If you move furni- ture, re- place it,
P-43			Five people each day are chosen by the teacher; only ones who can sit on sofa all day. After lunch, they are first to get drink. When finished, ta another person to get a drink. Ma use sofa for after-lunch rest.	9		•	During meetings, students with numbers of the day can sit on the couch. Group decides who can sit.		•		•
ŧ					•					•	

Figure 3. Procedural rules: Use of chairs (cont.).

EACHER GRADE RULE	M K-1	N K-1	5 2	P ?-3	0 3-4	R 4	Q 5	Մ 5-6	T 6	y ,1-6	N 1-6
P-44	Story rules: sit on floor,	Sit in front of waterbed during story.	<b>.</b>				Students are sup- posed to sit in the ruq area during story time		e e		•
_							(later this was revised to permit working on math).	o.			·
P-45				æ				Sixth-graders can stand dure ing assem- blies.	Sixth-grad- ers can stand dur- ing assem- blies,		
P-46	• •	. •						Black chairs are for teach- ers only (it has not been enforced, although students	Students are not to sit in the black chairs, which are reserved for teach- ers.		
•							•	are aware of it).			
P-47	٠	,		<b>y</b>	Take down chairs he- fore get- ting set- tled in	•					
					the morn- ing.			÷			,
P-48			:		•		· ·		Students are not to put their feet on their desks or tilt back in their chairs,		

Figure 3. Procedural rules: Use of chairs (cont.).

TEACHER	N K-1	N , '	5 2	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	0	41 5-6	1 6	¥ 1-6	₩ 1-6
HULF 1 P-49	Child of the day gets to choose someone and to- gether take the roll book to the office. Take roll book to school secretary's desk,	Hotation of Child of the Day is alpha- betically by first name.	*								
P-50	Big Book: Child of the Day sits on table and turns pages.	Child of the Day can choose a friend to help take roll hook to the office.			· · · · · ·		1.				,
P-51	Child of the Day turns lights off/on for films, come in to rest.	Child of the Day controls classroom lighting.			Students are ex- pected to turn off lights when they leave the class- room.			٠.			
P-52	Child of the Day washes dishes from snack time.						v.				
P-53	Child of the Day is leader in lines, on walks, and first in a game.		. د	•		:	• , • , • •			5 j	l

Figure 4. Procedural rules: Child of the day.



TEÁCHER GRÁDE	M K-1	N : K-1	5 ?	° P 2-		0 3-4	k 4	0 -	II 5-6	Ť 6	۷ 1-6	W - 1-6
RULF P-54	Child of the Day picks first 5 to get snacks.				3	•			ت ن			
P-55	Child of the Day first one to be dis- missed home.				•	:	•		v			7
P-56	Child of the Bay rings clean-up bell.	-	`		بي شر							
P-57	Every day alphabeti- cally by first namesa child is picked as (hild of the Day.	Take daily turns having Child of the Day respon- sibilities,								•		

Figure 4. Procedural rules: Child of the day (cont.).

TEACHER GRADE RULE	M K-1	N K-1	S '	P 2-3	n 3-4	* 8	. 0	IJ 5-6	† 6	V 1-6	u 1-6
P-58			After re- cess, go to sofa for a class meeting.	Students are to be sitting on floor, sofa, or chairs		ď,			•		<u> </u>
				when at group meeting,	٠				,	•	
P-59					Students are not supposed	Students are to stay at	•	٠		<u> </u>	•
÷			e		to leave class meet- ing before it ends,	class meet- ing until tracher ex- cuses them, int teach-			•	,	
						er finish before leaving the meet- ing.			•		
r-60			If ints of people want to par-				•				<del></del> .
<.			ticipate, teacher will assign numbers (sequence) to keep order,				- 4	•		<b>v</b>	• * · ·
2-61	<del></del> -		<u> </u>	No writing on chalk-			<del></del>			<del></del>	<u> </u>
				board dur- ing meet- ing.						•	
P-62							During meetings,				
							students should be facing each other		•		•

Figure 5. Procedural rules: Class meeting.



TEACHER GRADE	M K-1	N K-1		р 7-3	0 3-4	It 4	0	U 5-6_	† 6_	V 1-6	W 1-6
RHLE P-63			•			: \•	e	Students assigned to Teacher U's room should sit in her room during first meet- ing.	v.	•	•
P-6 <b>4</b>											Goods rules: you may pass on goods.
P-65					•	•	ئن -				You may tell a bad if you tell a good.

Figure 5. Procedural rules: Class meeting (cont.).

TI ACHER GRADI RILLE	. M - K−1	N K-1	5 2	P 2-3	0 3-4	R .	() 5	U 5-6	† 6	٧	<b>u</b>
P-66	During film, don't raise hand to make shadows (ok during leader tape).	n.						7-0	:	1-6	1-6
P : 6,7	Men you hear your name called, say some- thing.										
P-68		No indepen- dent time in the murn- ing for first grad- ers.							<del></del>		
P_69		Everyhody participates in all classroom activities.					<u> </u>				
P-10					. •	initials on board mean have a pen- alty.		,			
P-7]											Games day is usually the last Friday of
—		e e					·				the month or the Fri- day before vacation.
P-72			N.	:						,	Complaints are to be written and placed in "in" basket.

Figure 6. Procedural rules: Participation.

TEACHER M N S P O R O U T V W GRADE K-1 K-1 2 2-3 3-4 4 5 5-6 6 1-6 1-6 NO. Stap-

Mo slapping games are allowed.

igure 6. Procedural rules: Participation (cont.).

							•					
TEACHER GRADE RULE	м к-1	N K-1	\$ ?	P 7-3	0 3-4	R '	0 5	บ 5-6	1 6		۷ 1-6	u 1-6
P=74	Clean up your stuff.	Materials are to be put away,	Everyone clean up your area. Clean up your desk. Put away materials properly.	Before queen to recess, papers in desk. In addition, materials are to be organized.	Students must clean up before the end of the day.	Clean off desks at end of reading period. End of day, check all areas, put things in desk. Stu- dents are to clean up and walk out to recess and lunch.			•		All stu- dents are expected to clean up.	When you use materials, clean up and put back when you are finished. Put away ques when you are finished.
	If other things need clean- ing up, do it.	•	See if other clean up is need- ed and do it.		Children should pick up books and arrange them neataly on shelves.	Students are to stack hooks neatly,	Students should put their hooks away when they're through with them.					<u> </u>
P-76				Friday is desk inspec- tion; desk should be organized and clean.	Students are sup- posed to keep their desks clean.	Do not draw on desk.	t	Do not write on desks or chairs.				
P-77	When bell rings, clean up.					<u>.</u>	s.				•	
P- 78		Children place cups in the sink when done.		,						<u>-</u>		
P- 19		All dispose ables are to be thrown to garbage.							<u>.</u>		·.	

Figure 7. Procedural rules: Clean up.



TE ACHE R GRADE RUE I	M K-1	N K-1	\$ 2	P ?-3	0 3-4	R 4	0 5	U 5-6	t 6 °	γ ¥		₩ 1-6
P-80			May get a drink with- out asking,	Students may net drinks in classroom hut not dur- ing group meetings.		Students may get a drink without asking permis— sion.	No getting up for a drink while teacher is reading or during a meeting.		Students may get drinks without asking permis- sion.			
P-R1		tat snacks at table,		Students are to sit at desks to eat. If have little snack left, can eat it outside standing by door.			If they are eating in the room, they should be seated (refined to pruhihit eating on the couch).					
P-82				Snack time is just he- fore recess, snacks are to be eaten in the room,	<del></del>	Students are to have snacks at hearnning of morning recess.	e		<del></del>		<u> </u>	Snacks he- fore morn- ing recess only,
P-R3	Choose milk, or puice, pour your own drink, If you spill, clean up after your- self.		- ·	· ·	<del></del>						-	
P-84		Drinks are poured unity to a point of 2/3 full on the cup.		. •			·			_		
P-85							Students should get a drink of mater be- fore coming in from re-					

Figure 8. Procedural rules: Snacks.



TEACHER GRADE RULE	M K-1	N K-1	۶ ۶	р 7-3	() 3-4	R 4	9	บ 5-6	T 6	v 1-6	₩ 1-6 ·
A-T	When works ing on journals, students are sup- pnsed to write neatly.	When students are working on their journals, they are supposed to write neatiy and date every entry.	Students can chnose when they will write in their journals,	Students are to spend at least 15 minutes each day writing in their journals; they are to write neat- ly; if do not finish a page, write an- other date and start new day's entry; every entry should be dated.	imen students are working on their journals, they are supposed to write and date every entry.	Journals are pri- vafe, no one to read with- out per- mission except teacher. Date on Journal page every day. If do not fill a page, skip line, put date and start next entry. Write both sides of page. Make daily entry. Teacher will collect (some days) to check for quality.	When work- ing in their jour- nals, stu- dents are to write neatly.			Students are as- signed to work in their jour- nals rnughly twice a week.	1-0
A-2	When stu- dents need help spel- ling a word, they are to bring per- sonal dic- tionary so teacher can write word in them, open to page where word should he written,	When stu- dents need help spel- ling a word, they are to bring per- sonal dic- tionary so teacher can write word in them, open to page where word should be written,	When stu- dents need help spel- ling a word, they are to look in the dictionary hefore ask- ing the teacher.	When stu- dents need help spel- ling a word, they are to bring per- sonal dic- tionary so tearher can write word in them, open to page where word should be written,	When stu- dents need help spel- ling a word, they are to hring per- sonal dic- tionary so teacher can write word in them, open to page where word should be written,	When stu- dents need help spel- ling a word, they are to bring per- sonal dic- tionary so teacher can write word in them, open to page where word should be written.	When stu- drots need help spel- ling a word, they are to bring per- sonal dic- tionary sor teacher can write word in them, open to page where word should he written,				

Figure 9. Academic rules: Work behavior.

TFACHER IJRADE RIILE	-	N K-1	<u> </u>		ິດ 3-4	R 4	0 5	U 5-6	1 6.	V 1-6	W 1-6
A-3		Students are expected to read during sitent reading.		Students are to read during si- lent read- ing.	Teacher expects students to read borb text- books and paperbacks during si- tent read- ing,	Students are sup- posed tn read dur- ing sitent reading.	Buring si- lent read- ing, stu- dents are not to spend a large amount of time look- tng for a book, They should be pre- pared to read,			Students are sup- posed to read dur- ing silent reading,	
A-4					Fourth- draders should write in cursive unless it is impos- sible for them.	Students should always write in cursive,		Cursive writing is demanded in story—writing and other subjects except spelling.	All sixth- qraders are to write in cursive ex- cept when given spe- cial per- mission (e.g., can print in tests).	Those who know cur- sive should use it.	
A-5					Students are sup- posed to complete homemork assign- ments.	Students are to take home- work home, bring it hack along with hooks, etc. Hoth- er may not bring it	t: - ".				
A-6						Can do partner- reading if ask permis- sion.	Students must have their own houks dur- ing silent reading un- less given permission to partner- read.	ч			

Figure 9. Academic rules: Work behavior (cont.).

TEACHER GRADE RULE	M K-1	N K-1	, , ,	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	0 5	U T 5-6 6	y 1-6	W 1-6
A-7 _		Ł.		•	v	i		Mork should be neat and clean.	finished product should have no errors.	ř
A-8	Mear paint shirt when you paint,	,								•
P-A	May take painting home nest day to al- low to dry.							.•		
A-10	Keep paint in dishpan,								<u> </u>	
A-11	Put hrush in right color paint,									
A-12		۰	,		Puring reading time, stop only if you have a problem.					
A-13				•	Homework should not he crum- bled.					
A-14	.1 <				Stories are not to be written in the journal. This rule was dropped the third week of school).			· .		

Figure 9. Academic rules: Work behavior (cont.).



		es.	•					=			
TEACHER GRADE RULE	H K-I	N K-]	5 7	P 7-3	() 34	R 4	9	U 5-6	¹ĭ 6	v 1-6	¹₩ 1-6
A-15					Independent activities are to be done alone, Amendment; Students can collab- orate if they want.						
A-16					When using nnn-cnnsum-able text-books, as-signments are in he done on a separate piece of paper.	, .					
A-1/	•					Students are required to share hooks must choose options and vary them, can- not do same process all the time.					
A-18				\$	v .	e.	Students are sup- posed to use com- plete sen- tences when writ- ing papers.			v	
A-19	•. `					a.		Skill les- snns must be done with teach- er.			,

Figure 9. Academic rules: Work behavior (cont.).



TEACHER	м	N	,	D	0	R					_	
GRADI RULE	K-1	K-1	\$ 2	P ?-3	3-4	 	•	Q 5	U 5-6	· 6	v 1-6	и 1-б
A-20			a		•	w .			Individual reading assignments should be done in order.			
A-21		·							Story must be read be- fore pack- et is received	Read story first.		
A-??	<del> ,</del>									Then do writ- ten work.		
A-23		,								Then do worksheet.		
A-24			•					• . •	-		Writing should be legible.	
A-25			- :								Words don't have to be spelled	
	-										correctly in journal or in cre- ative writ-	•

Figure 9. Academic rules: Work behavior (cont.).



								•			•
TEACHER GRADE RULE	м К-1	N	\$ ?	P 2-3	() 3-4	R 4	n 5	U 5-6	T 6	y 1-6	W. 1-6
A-26		Responsi- bility for completion of tasks.	Conferen- ces will be used to deter- mine when finished	Students are ex- pected to finish as- signed work by	Students are sup- posed to work dur- ing work time (on	Students who are to complete work, if don't do consis-	Students should be working on the work assignment,	Work which is not fin- ished in class must be done at home.	0	Students are sup- posed to finish their work.	All work must be completed.
•			work should be com- pleted,	the end of the day.	task).	tently, will have tu stay in and finish at recess					* <b>*</b>
						or after school, Students may have free time	***************************************				•
					·	of com- plete work before end of day, Some work			•		
				,	<i>;</i> *	not due un- til end of day or week, students must know when due and com-					
· 			<u>.</u>		a :	piete on time.			•		
A-27		First grade finished work goes in folders.	Completed work yoes in the or- ange bin on the teacher's box. Unfinished papers are to be returned and placed in work folder.	Finished papers qu in wooden work box. Unfinished papers are to be returned and placed in work folder.	Mnrksheets go into in- dividual folders (writing, stories, math, read- ing). Pu- pils are responsi- ble for writing and other fold- ers.	Finished papers are to go in various "In-Bas-kets," folders stay in desk so can keep work organnized; one folder is for math; everything else unes in other	All unfin- ished work must be in desk.		Finished papers go in vari-ous boxes on table in the room.		Put your folder in the "in" basket at the end of the hour. Keep the journals and job sheets in the folders. Get folder with work-sheets from your cubby.

Figure 10. Academic rules: Finishing work.



TE ACHER GRADE	M K-1	د, M ۴-1	S	ρ΄ 2-1	. 0	R	ņ	U	1	V	, <b>W</b>
RIII F — A-2H				When finish work, start a new activity (e.g., games, books); do not sit there or ask teacher what to do.	1-4	When finish work, students are to exercise skill in finding through to do.		~5-6	If finish assignment early, students are to work on another as signment or read a book.	1-6	No free time until your work is completed. Ouring wor time, stay on task.
A-29		Kindergar- ten fin- ished work goes on shelf above coat hanger.		,			o	<i>#</i>			
A-30				,		ilse study perind to finish work for the whole day, may work on any un- finished work, let people get their work done.					
A-31			ų				Students should put a "C" on their reading record sheet when they have conferenced with the teacher.				•
A-3?				,	·		tvery day students must record what they read follow- ing silent reading.				ę .
0		Ī.	Figure	e 10. A	cademic	rules:	Finishin 79	g work	(cont.).	. '	я

TEACHER N N S P U R U U T V W GRANF K-1 R-1 2 2-3 3-4 4 5-6 6 1-6 1-6

RILE
A-33

A-34

A-34

Even if something is hard, keep try, ing to do it.

Figure 10. Academic rules: Finishing Work (cont.).

TEACHER GRADE RIN E	M K-1	N K-1	, ,	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	0	U 5-6	t 6	۷ 1-6	u 1-6
A-35		Write your first name at the top of the pa- per in D'nealian- handwriting,		Students are to put their names on their pa- pers; also date.	Students should put the date on their work.	Put name and date on papers each day. Name and date on top line. If math, put page number.	Names should be put on the top of the paper. Later changed to name on left and date	Put page numbers on math assign- ments. Names are supposed to be on pa- pers. Stu- dents are supposed to	Student's name is to be written on inside of front cover of workbook.		Write your name and date no wour pa- pers.
						1	on right, Page num- her is also required on math assignments,	put their rames on their books.			
A- 36				Fifteen words is minimum for				Whole sen- tences should be	All students must do re-	•	
•				spelling list, if pick more and don't do well, have to go				written when doing spelling tests. Amendment:	view spet- ling words each week, but idea words and challenge		
				hack to 15; test is on Friday, List must include					words are optional.		
				words stu- dent does not already know how to spell.				·			٠.
r- 37	Before conting, wash your hands,										
A- 38		Children can				<del></del>		<del></del>			
		choose activi- ties,									•

Figure 11. Academic rules: Starting work.



					. *			: •			
FEACHER GRADE RULL —	K-1	N K-1	5	P 2-3	0 3-4	K 4	() 5	บ 5-6	1 6	۷ 1-6	u 1-6
A- 39	,	•		After met- ting in- structions from the teacher, students are to do to desks and go right to work on as- signment,	•	:	,				1-6
A-40					<u> </u>				· · ·		
0	۹					,	,	Students are to yet the work assign- ment when they have been absent.			
		•		·				`.		Students at supposed to be prepared for lessons	n d ·

Figure 11. Academic rules: Starting work (cont.).

FACHER GRADE RULE —	M /	k-1	\$ 2	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	ŋ 5	) 5-6	T 6	y 1-6	u 1-6
A.47			After be- ing given procedural tnstruc- tions, ask questions. After work begins, if you have questions, check with another student before ask- ing teacher.	instructions, asking ques- tions, other students are answering questions, or telling stories,		Students are to re- member what they are told to do. leacher will not repeat la- ter. It is ok to up to the teacher for help. No not in- terrupt when teach- or is work- ing with another student(s) unless bonafide,		Students are not sup- posed to come up to the teacher and inter- rupt her while she is instruc- ting. Wait until teach- er is fin- ished.	attention to the teacher and not do other work when he is talking.	Students are sup- posed to follow in- structions.	Listen to the teach- er.
·				Watch teach- er when de- monstrates,			8				
A-4R		Raise hands to respond to teacher.	When the person is done, you may ask questions. Raise your hand if you have questions. Only one person speaks at a time.		In a large group situ- ation, you have to raise your hand so that people have an opportunity to be heard.		Students should raise hand before participating in group discussion (not always enforced).		Students are to raise hands to talk; teacher will ignore hands raised while he is explaining or discussing something. Raise hand only when want to add to discussion.	Students should raise their hands and get ac- knowledged by the trach- er before they answer a question.	

Figure 12. Academic rules: Interacting with teacher.

TEACHER GRADE RULE	К-1	N K-1	5 2	P ?-3	0 3-4	- R - 4	() 5	U 5-6	T 6	V 1-6	W 1-6
A-49			If you need help from the teach- er, raise your hand, When teach- er is in conference with an- other stu- dent, don't interrupt,		Teacher and student in reading conference should not be inter- rupted.		No one is to inter- rupt a reading conference. They will usually be ignored.		Students may get feacher's attention by going to him or raising hand, not by calling out his name. It is ok to	raise their hands when they need help. Students should not interrupt the teacher while she	;
		1.		·	b	•			ask teach- er ques- tions when- he is not working with other students.	is working with another student.	
A-50		"Think time" a waiting period to respond to the teacher's challenge.				Students are to take time to think he- for giving oral nr written answers.		٠			
A-51		First grade works on instruction- al tasks with leach- er N. Kin- dorgartiers	77 p				**				
		work with Teacher H.	<u>.</u> -							•	

Figure 12. Academic rules: Interacting with teacher (cont.).

						n ,					
TEACHER GRADE RILL -	M K-1	N	S	P 2-1	3-4	H 4	0 5	U 5-6	6	y 1-6	W 1-6
A-42					,	When stu- dents take a test, they are to do it alone, not share.	Tests are to be done independent- ly.		Do tests by your- self.		When teacher tells you to do so, do your own work, and don't give answers to others.
A-43				Students are not to start tests until teach- er tells them to he- gin; must quit work- ing when teacher says to stop.		Do not start test until teacher starts you.			* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
A-44 .		h						final spell- ing tests - are done in spelling booklet.			
A-45	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				,				If have gues- tions, put hand up or go to the teacher dur- ing test.		
A-46								_	When fin- ished, take test to the teacher,		

Figure 13. Academic rules: Taking a test.

											•
TEACHER GRADE	M K- 3	N K-1	\$ 2	P 2-3	0 3-4	В 4	0	1) 5-6	† 6	V 1-6	₩ 1-6
RULE A- 52	No more children at an activity than allowed, if you see the correct number of children at an activity, wait until there's room.	If there not rnow at a table, pupil must wait until space he- comes avail- able.	will have a chance to complete a task before moving to another. May move to another	•			. , ,		,	1-0	1-0
		٠.	task without asking the Leacher.				•				,
A-53	Only do one each day; hut can change tomorrow. Everyone will get to work at each one.						v .		- <u> </u>		
A-54		Centers are places to work on as- signed tasks.				o 6.	<u></u>			,	
		ti		,	N.				, .	In group settings, students should work as a group.	

Figure 14. Academic rules: Working in a group.

	,	p.		·							• '
TEACHER GRADE RULF -	H K-1	N K-1	S - 2	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	0 5	U 5-6	1 6	V 1-6	₩ 1-6
A- 56	•		u				\ •	Children can read anywhere but Teach- er I's or Y's room, First amend-			
						•		ment: stu- dent must be visible, Second amend- ment: must be in room if grade was	•		,
_							· 	lower than B on last . packet.			
A-57			,		,				itudents re not		
					, 16		٠	t p w e p	re not o sharpen encils hen teach- r is ex- laining r class		
		16						d o t q o m	iscussion r recita- ion is oing on; therwise, ay sharpen encils as		e .
A-58				<del> </del>					ecessary.	<del></del>	·
,		r			٠.			f: ap wi	erious work s to be pproached ith a seri- is attitude; pringling		
			9		•			fu	inny an- iers, etc.		

Figure 15. Academic rules: Miscellaneous.

TEACHER H N S P O R O U T V M

GRADE K-1 K-1 2 2-3 3-4 4 5 5-6 6 1-6 1-6

RULE A-59

Two grades

on reading packet:

a. Correct-answering question
correctly.
b. Quality-if written
neatly, punctuated correctly, complete sentences, made
qood sense.

Figure 15. Academic rules: Miscellaneous (cont.).



Ž,

FACHER	# // K-}	N K-1	\$ 2	р 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	0 5	U 5-6	T 6	V 1-6	1-6
1-1	tisten quietly during story.	No talking during story,		• 4	No talking during story time.			Students are not sup- posed to distract the teach- er during story (talking, moving,	Students are to pay attention and "keep the peace" when teach- er or other students are read-		When teacher reads to class, stu- dents must he quiet.
				·		· ·	_	etc.).	ing aloud.	_	
1-?		Children are to work quietly at centers. Talking is permitted only if it does not distract anynne else.	Small groups: You may talk spontaneously without raising your hand. More personal interaction in an informal setting.			Talk re- lated to work is ok so long as it is not too loud so no une is denied space to work and no one re- ports cau't work be- cause too noisy.		Students 'shouldn't be talk- ing when they are supposed to be working (on task).	Quiet talk is allowed during work time unless teacher hears voice across the room that is too loud (this in- cludes yell- ing as well as loud talk).		Mork quiet- ly when si- lence is nerded or requested.
1-3		7		Students are not to talk dor- ing silent reading.	No talk- ing during silent reading,	Silent reading is to be quiet; it is to he non-werhal. This includes when choosing a hnok.	During silent read- ing, pupils should be silent and reading		 F	Students are not supposed to talk during si- lent read- ing.	
1-4	_					Students are to be quiet dur- ing class meeting,	At a meet- ing, one person talks at a time.		Class meet- ing: only 1 person talks at a time. Teacher is leader and calls on people to talk.	During shar- ing, students are not sup- posed to tall too long (1) 2 minutes on the average). This is an ei- planation but may not he a rule because it may not be sanctioned.	

Talking and noise rules: Talking during academic work. Figure 16.

						•				* · · · .	
TEACHER GRADE RULE	M, K-1	N K-1	\$ ?	P ?-3	. 0 3-4	К 4	() 5	u 5-6	† 6	<b>y</b> 1-6	N 1-6
1-5				Students are not to talk during movie.					No talking during the movie.		
1-6						No talk- ing dur- ing test.			· .	1	
1-7		Indepen- dent activi- ties must be calm with no running or yelling.	ı.				*			,	
T-8			Sharing: no off-task talking.						<u> </u>		
1-9	. *					•			Teacher will not start les- son until class is quiet.		• • • •
T-10									Discussion/ recitation: no talking unless called on.		· .

Figure 16. Talking and noise rules: Talking during academic work (cont.).

TEACHER GRADE	M K-1	N K-1	5 2	P 2-3	0 3-4	, R	ŋ 5		U 5-6	† 6	y 1-6	W 1-6
Rute T-11	If wild and rowdy, have to det out of tower.	Tower is a quiet place.						-			λ,	
T-12		Children do not talk during re- laxation,									. <u></u>	
7-13			Put your head on the desk and rest quiet- ly after lunch.					1		· .		a
T- Í4										Students must be quiet be- fore will be dis- missed.		· · · .
	2#   N			,	<u></u>		,				Don't turn on the ra- dio.	

Figure 17. Talking and noise rules: Talking during nonacademic work.

TE ACHER	. M	N	5		,			•			e .
GRADE -	K-1	<u> </u>		P 2-1	1-4	R 4	0 5	υ <u>5-6</u>	T 6	¥ 1-6	₩ 1-6
T-16			Don't yell in the classroom.	•		,	Students are not supposed to yell in the class- room.	<b>1</b>		Students are not supposed to talk loudly.	• ,
,1-11 °					•	Students can sit where they want un- less they get too noisy.			When students are too noisy teacher will count feacher 5, students stay in an extra 5 minutes at recess, lunch, or after school.		G.
T-18					o	If noise level is too high, students must be nonverbal for 5 minutes.		<u>.</u>		٠	
T-19							Students are not supposed to whistle in class.				
J-20			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•			Talking is allowed at other times unless oth- erwise spe- cified.				

Figure 18. Talking and noise rules: General talking rules.

TEACHER GRADE	M K-1	N K-1	<b>S</b> 2	P 2-3	0 3-4	fi 4	Q 5	U 5-6	T .	<b>y</b> 1-6	W 1-6
RUI E		isten qui- etly to teacher during in- struction.	6		Students are expec- ted to lis- ten to in- structions.	Students are to lis- ten when teacher is talk- ing with <sup>5</sup> class, giv- ing direc- tions, etc.		Students are sup- posed to listen to instruc- tions. Offficult tasks will not be re- peated;	When tracher is ex- plaining something, students are to listen and do the work; they are not to talk.	All ques- tions should he asked after in- structions have heen given.	Listen to the direc- tions from the teach- er,
1-27			tights out: Get quiet, listen for announce- ments or instruc- tions, then ask ques- tions,				•	₹ .		e '	•
1-23			•						Students are to be quiet when teacher is passing out papers and are to wait until teach- er has fin- ished before asking ques- tions.		

Figure 19. Talking and noise rules: Talking to the teacher.

FEACHER GRADE RULE	M K-1 .	N K-1	5 7	, р 2-3	0 	R' .	0 5	U 5-6	, 1	V 1-6	₩ 1-6
M-1	In the morning when you enter the room, sit at the edge of " the circle,					Students are to sit down and settle down when they enter classroom,			egy e	When the students enter the classroom, they are supposed to be in the meet	1-0
-			· ( )	, a	· · ·	•		-	en e	ing area by the time the teacher qets there.	.*
M-?	After re- cess, when you have entered the room, stretch on the floor and rest.			•	,			:			1 ,
M a	1		Go to desk for lights- out rest period.				•			•	<u> </u>
. M-4	3		ę	Students amay not move disk at random must have teacher permission.					, ,	•	
M-5	•	. ,	···	Silent read- ing is to be done at each student's desk,		·				<i>y</i>	
M-6	÷.		•	•		Students are not to wander off when work reg in groups	S	•	e		

Figure 20. Mobility rules: Classroom movement.

ERIC C

9.4

TEACHER GRANI RULE -	K-1	N <u>r-1</u>	<u> </u>	P ?-3	0 3-4	 R 4		0 5	1) 5-6	1 6	V 1-6	N 1-6
M-1					·				Students are not supposed to walk through the sensori-motor room.		•	
M-R	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			٠		 	· _			No hands springs in the classroom.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Ħ-9			2.3				_	_		.•		If you are assigned a place, stay there.

Figure 20. Mobility rules: Classroom movement (cont.).

		_					·						•				
TEACHER GBADE ROLE	M K-1 .	N K-1	3	р ?-:	3	() 3-4		R 4		0 5		I) 5-6	1 6		y 1-6		H 1-6
M-10	Four people at a time on each level of tower,	four EFT- dren can be on each flour of the tower.	Only three people on the loft at a time (Cluster rule).								s	۵	,	*	No more than two persons i the read- ing loft at a time		1-0
M-11	When clean- ing hell <sup>1</sup> rings, get out of tower.					-			•			•	<u> </u>	. لا		•	c.
M- 12	Only play in the ctower dur- ing acti- vity time,			· ·						<u>*</u>	· .		· · · · · ·	• •	•		
M-11	Don't jump from tower.									<del></del>	7 .						
H- (4	Dun't slide down the rope,		•	14			-							٠,			<u> </u>
M-15		Four at a time are allowed in the block.		<u> </u>	,^.*	q				<u>.</u>	<del></del>	<del>`</del>		·	:		
M-16		four people sit on the waterhed at a time.	<i>S</i> ,	a /		•					-					:	

Figure 21. Mobility rules: Specialized equipment.

				,				2			
TE ACHER	M	N	\$	P	()	R	Q	U	1	٧	u
GRADE	K-1	K-1	?	2-3	3-4	4	Š	5-6	6	1-6	1-6
RIILE <sup>*</sup> M-17	Walk on't run in the classroom so that no one gets hurt.	There is no run- no run- ning in the class- room.	Walk don't run in the classroom,				No run- ning in the class- room.			· ·	5
M-18		Leave space between yourself and the next per- son in line.				,					
M- 19		Children do not touch each other.			,	٠					

Figure 22. Mobility rules: Physical contact.

TEACHER GRADE RULE —	M K-1	N K-1	S 2	P ?-3	0 3-4	R 4	Q 5	t1 5-6	T 6	v 1-6	₩ 1-6
E-1				Do not "put duwn" other kids.			Students are not to put each other down.	Students are not to be dis- respectful to the other chil- dren.		Don't up- set other students.	Don't put down others for making mistakes or anything else.
€-2		Everybody does own work. Bon't interfere with others.				When stu- dents fin- ish, they are not to inter- fere with students who are working,				Don't dis- tract others while work- ing.	·
E-3			What's in- side your desk is your property. Respect oth- er peoples' property.				Beware of and respect the needs of others (e.g., don't both- er peers). Respect the rights and property of others.	Students are to show respect for the property of others (either peers or school).			
E-4		The amount children may eat is equal but is determined by the teacher.			1				i,		Food must be shared with all.
E-5		Prople will be expected to be pleasant to each other (im- plicit).		·							

Figure 23. Ethical rules: Courtesy to other students.

TE ACHER GRADE RUI (	M K- L	N N	?	P 7-3	0 3-4	В Д	0	U 5-6	1 6	y 1-6	W 1-6
£-10	<i>ا</i> لر	,	•	. * ,			Students are not to ask how well other students did on com- parable tasks (i.e., tests, pro- jects).				Your work and level are not to be com- pared with others.
E-11					-					Students are not to question the teach- er's author- ity.	
E-12	C)					,				Students are to ad- mit rule violations.	
E-13		. · ·				. <b>e</b>				Students are not supposed to tattle.	e
E-14						•					Don't ask the teacher for personal information about other students; ask the student.

Figure 24. Ethical rules: Respect for teacher.

								*			
TFACHER GRANF RILL	M K-1	K+1	?	P 2-3	0 3-4	4	5	5-6	t 6	V 1-6	W 1-6
£-15	٠.	Ch) Edren must not hit each other, shove or push.	Don't hit each other.	No not push one another.	Jabbing another student is unacceptable (involves hitting, kicking, etc.).	Students are not to hit or fuss with one another.					Don't hit others (people are not for hitting).
F-16		Conflicts can be resulved verbally.				Do not tell the teacher about things that happen when the teacher is not pres- ent (i.e., on play- ground) un- less stu- dent who tells was there and involved.		Students are to settle their own conflicts (problems).			
E-17		If all at- tempts to verhally resolve conflicts fail, the teacher is available to help,					2	5			
		<b>:</b>	•						•	-	

Figure 25. Ethical rules: Resolution and prevention of conflict.

TEACHER GRADE -	M K-1	N K-1	5 2	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	Q 5	II 5\$76	T ,	v 1-6	W 1-6
51-1	y	First grade cannot run canywhere except on grass play- field. Any-	•		No running to and from the yard.	•	Students cannot run out to re- cess.	There should be no running when moy— ing from Classroom	,	Don't run at school; walk every- where (ex- cept qrassy area).	Walk to and from class.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	bidy running mist go back and walk (serious of- fenders are "benched").		ä			·	to play yard.	,		• 
\$1-2	હ	Dog't run on black- top.	-	Students are not to to run on the blacktop.		No ruoning on the blacktop; ok to ruo on the grass.				1,	
S1-3		Students can play at the hottom, hut not the top of the hill.	·	Students are not to play on the hillside,	)			•			
SI-4	L	· ·		Students are not to walk on the fence (wooden rail).						s.	
\$1.5		•				No chicken fighting on the wonkey bars,		,		٥	
51-6					•	Do not play on new play- ground un- less teach- er is there,	•				0

Figure 26. School-imposed rules: Recess.

Figure 26. School-imposed rules: Recess (cont.).

	•										ر ۲۰	
	ACHER GRADI RULE	M K-1	N K-1		P 2-3	n 3-4	# 4	0 5	U 5-6	T 6	۷ 1-6	ะ พ 1-6
	S1-9	Gum chewang rute.	Gum chewing rule.	Gum chewing rule.	Gum chewing ru!e.	Gum chewing rute.	Gum chewing rule,	Gum chewing rute.	Gum chewing rule.	.9	Gum chewing rule.	Gim chewing rule.
	\$1-10 ;	Please flush the toilet.		After you use the toilet, flush.	2	,	c			Students are to flush the toilets in rest- rooms and	Keep hath- rooms in or- der by flush- ing toilets and throwing	
		:	-		5			,		put paper towels in containers.	paper towels in trash cans (school rule).	•
5	51-11			Don't waste the paper				_		٠.		<u>.</u>
		,	j .	towels (school= wide).				•		9		To the second se
S	i1-12			·	Students cannot thew qum in the yard (he- cause theyo may choke).					,		
S	1-13		•	·		· wheel was	Give name when give ball in; Can't take		•			
	_						out hall for an- other per- sun.	•				
S	I-14 :	,					Clean up your mess at lunch.					
S	I- 15 _				· .		Do not throw food.					V .
5	1-16						Get excused by adult to go to bath- room at looch,					ų

Figure 27. School-imposed rules: Deportment.

TEACHER GRADE	М - K-1	K-f N	. S. ?	P o 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	Q or	5-6	T 6	¥ . ø	W 1-6
ROLE SI-17	Kindergar- ten, first- and second- graders can- not ride bike to school.	k, 1, and 2 students cannot ride bikes to school,	Second- graders cannot ride bi- cycles to school,	Third grade students need a note from parents in order to ride bikes to school.	Thirif- graders need a note from parents to ride bikes to school. Fourth- graders don't need	•	0	•		First- and sec- ond-graders cannot ride bikes to school, Third-grad- ers are al- lowed if	First- and sec- ond-graders cannot ride bikes to school, Third-grad- ers can if they have
			·	č1 ,·	a note.				, ,	they have a note from their par- ents. Fourth- and sixth-grad- ers do not need a note.	a note from their par- ents. Fourth- and sixth-grad- ers do not need a note.
S1-18	Unless it's raining, wait on playground until school starts.	. •	v	n		· ·	, <b>N</b>				,
21-14	Before school, en- ter cluster playground through wooden gate,					•		-		Students are sup- posed to enter the oclassroom through the class- foom door.	
SI-20		÷		Students are not to ride bikes no blacktop,	<del>\(\frac{1}{2}\)</del>						
SI- <b>8</b> YI ►			-					*		In the morning, lock your bike and go on to the big play-ground,	,

Figure, 28. School-imposed rules: Coming to school.

								•	•7	_	
TEACHER GRADE RULE:	- M - K-1	N K-1	S 2	р 7-3	0 3-4	R 4	0	11 5-6	۲ ۲ 6	, y °	• W 1-6
\$1-72	Don't come until 8:45.		(3			,			•	Don't he	
	•		•		•					grounds un- til hell	
45					•	**			•	rings at 8:45.	,

Figure 28. - School-imposed rules: Coming to school (cont.).

TEACHER GRADE' RULE	M K-1	N K-1	\$ 7	P 7-3	0 3-4	R 4	0 5	U 5-6	t 6	V 1-6	ม 1-6
S1-23	Ourside.		Cannot enter room unt+1 in- a vited to do so by one in	÷ o	Students shouldn't he in clus- ter without a teacher.	•	No students are Supposed to be in the classroom without a	•	Students are to stand qui- etly at the door at	Students should not be in the classroom without a	Non't enter class un- less teach- er is there.
,	8		charge.			٥	teacher,	d.	the begin- ning of school, after re- cess, P.E., and wait for teacher to let them in.	teacher (or princi- pal).	,
\$1-24	5	و د	e,	•		<i>ই</i>		? .	Office phone is used only with adult's permission,		
\$1-25			· {}	•		`s •			42	Library is off limits unless there is an adult in the room.	

Figure 29. School-imposed rules: Absence of adults:

TEACHER GRADE PULE	M K-1	H K-1	\$ ?	2-3 (C	0 3-4	R 4	<u> </u>	U 5-6	ř 6	y 1-6	W 1-6
\$1-26 		a*	•			When stu- dents are absent, they are to hring a note from home explain- ing why.		100	¢.		
_									r		
\$1-27		•		0	• .	. •	•		Permission slips and emergency treatment forms must be signed by parents and returned		<u>.</u>
 J		\	•						to school before a student may no on a field trip.		

Figure 30. School-imposed rules: Parental responsibilities.

TEACHER GRADE	M K-1	N <u>K</u> -1	S	p 2+3	0 3-4	R 4	n 5	. U 5-6	1	, <b>v</b>	° <b>u</b>
RIME (	When sit- ting on the floor, sit so that oth- ers can see.		Sit flat so others can see during sharing/ discus- sion.			·		3-0	6	1-6	1.6′
MŢSC-?		No wrest- ling or rough play on the circle.				Students are not to bounce on sofa or pillows,			4		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
MISC-3	•	Thowing of an inappro- priate on- ject is not allowed.	8		<b>a</b> dinisir,,,,,	No not throw balls or rocks in the class- room.		<u> </u>			
MISC-4		Share ex- periences and special items, but don't share tnys.	÷								Toys may be brought to be shown hut not to be played with.
MISCLA		Children are to stay on task un- til the time period is over.			,	•		•		Students are to pay attention (tie on task).	
- MISC-6		•		•	Students are not to tip chairs when sit-ting in them (no dangerous hehavior).		,	0	,	Students are not to behave in a danger- ous manner to self.	
M15F-7	•			Students are to han- dle the rat quotly.	w	,	Students are to be careful with the run.			,	•

Figure 31. Miscellaneous rules.



TEACHER GRADE RULE	м к-1	k-1	\$ ?*	р ?-3	0	R 4	1) 5	U 5-6	ĭ 6_	v 1-6	₩ 1-6
MISI-R		· .		<b>&amp;</b>				•		Students are not to fool around un- less it's free time,	if not playing game, stu- dents must be involved in some approved activity.
MISC-9	If you don't know how to use something, ask a first-grader.		a						٠		
MISC-10	Don't mis- use mater- ials. Use them ap- prograte- ly.	•									
MISC-11	Don't bring valuable or inappropri- ate toys to school.						4.	1.			
MISC-12		Children are to sit cross-lynged whenever they are asked to sit on the floor in a group.	7			8			·		
MISC-13		Non't hang articles on surfaces.		<b>&gt;</b>			<u> </u>		<u> </u>		

Figure 31. Miscellaneous rules (cont.).



TEACHER GRADE RULE	M K-1	N K-1_	5 ?	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	Q 5	lj 5-6	° † 6	y 1-6	W.
HISC-14		Children are to lay flat on the floor during re- laxation.	<b>n</b> - 1							1-0	1-6
MfSC-15			On	When teacher turns light on and off, stu- dents are to quiet down and get on task (e.g., silent read- ing).		•					·
MISC-16				If work is complete, must qo to movie.				<u> </u>			
MISC-17			_	Ask, if you're not sure.							•
MISC-18			٤.			When stu- dents are ralled on, they may choose not to respond,	•				
MISC-19	:	Fr wh	nhts out. eeze. Stop at you're ing.	,				<u> </u>			•
M1SC-20		et se to sn or	sten qui- ly and re- pectfully, the per- n speaking sharing, n't play.							·	

Figure 31. Miscellaneous rules (cont.).



TEACHER GRADE RILE	M K-1	N K-1	S ?	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	7 Q 5	U 5- <u>6</u>	т 6	y 1-6	W 1-6
MISC-21			If the teacher is eyeing you, qet back to task.						· ·		
M1SC-22	·		Don't hit others, wrestle, or fool around.						10 (1) (1) (2) (3) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4		•
MISC-23	·		Students cannot be a kinder-questen helper more than once per week.	,			^.				ê .
M1SC-24			Don't lose books.			•		-			·
MISC-25			Disrespect won't be tolerated (towards au- thority fig- ures).		•						
MINC-26									Teachers will de- cide in each individual case regard- ing rule in- fractions.		
M15C-27		<u> </u>								Students are to make de- clsions quickly.	

Figure 31. Miscellaneous rules (cont.).



TEACHER	M	e N	S	P	0				•	÷		
GRADE RULT MISC-2H	<u>K-1</u>	K-1	2	2-3	3-4	R 4		, O 5	U 5-6		y . 1-6	₩ 1-6
· -							· 		. ય	<del>-</del>	Students are to solve problems in a non-inter- fering way.	
MISC-29	w ·				J			0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Students are not to worry about how well other students are doing.	3
MISC-30					<u> </u>					,	Students are to tie their shoe- laces.	
MISC-31	e	:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		U						Good partic- ipation re- quires quod posture.	
MISC-32	· · · .										Students are to make their own decisions during free time.	
MISC-33											Students are not to distract the teach- er by chang- ing the sub- ject while they are qet- ting repri- manded.	
MISC-34											Students are to be in control of them- selves.	

Figure 31. Miscellaneous rules (cont.).



TEACHER GRADE	M K-1	N K-1	S ?	P 2-3	0 3-4	R 4	0 5	U 5-6		<u> </u>	N 1-6
RULE MISC-35						-	•	•		Students should be willing to participate in sharing.	. =
		4	_						•		· .
M1SC-36	6								·	Students are to keep schedule and the week's	•
						•				work on clipboard.	
MISC-37					· ·				ø		Binders are not
HI3C-37	,		4								to be taken

Figure 31. Miscellaneous rules (cont.).

